A

REJOYNDER

to Mr. WILLS his *Vindiciæ*:

Wherein

The Antiquity for Believers, and Novelty of *Infant Baptism* is further confirmed.

As also,

His groundless Appeal distinctly answer'd, and the Forgeries and Mistakes boasted of, still found to be his own.

With an Appeal to his Conscience about the same.

That the words of Tertulian *and* Nazianzen *shew it was long before all were agreed of the time or Necessity of Baptizing Infants before the use of Reason, in case they were like to live to Maturity.*

——*It was thought less needful to give it* [viz. Infants Baptism,] *a particular express mention in the Records and History of the Church* [viz. In those times] Mr. Baxter *in his* More Proofs, *p.* 279.

By *H. Danvers.*

Matth. 5. 11. *And shall say all manner of evil against you falsly for my names sake.*

Job 16. 10. *They have gaped upon me with their mouths, and have smote me upon the cheek reproachfully.*

Psal. 119. 42. *I shall have wherewithal to answer him that reproacheth me, for I trust in thy word.*

Printed for *Francis Smith*, at the *Elephant* and *Castle*, near the *Royal-Exchange*, 1675.

The PREFACE.

BEfore I had finiſhed with Mr. Baxter, I was firſt aſſaulted by a new adverſary, one Mr. Whiſton, and again by my old Antagoniſt Mr. Wills, not ſuffering me ſcarce to take breath, and three to one you know is odds. But hearing, that Mr. H. a meer ſtranger to me, had undertaken Mr. Whitſton, I have obtained ſo much leaſure, to conſider what our 3d. Triumvir hath further to ſay to me. And whom I find upon a ſerious peruſal inſtead of giving that due ſatisfaction, my ſober Reply, (and all good men) might expect from him, for his manifold detected errors in Antiquity, abuſe of Authors, ſcurrility and indignity to my perſon (a meer ſtranger to him) injurious reproaches to the whole party of Baptiſts, (as well in this as other Nations; not only loading the profeſſors thereof with his ſlanders, but the profeſſion it ſelf, as leading to Blaſphemy and Immorality) is pleaſed notwithſtanding to come forth in this wrathful, ſelf-juſtifying, and revengeful Spirit, abounding ſtill in his repeated and renewed errors and reproaches; as though an impenitent ſtanding by error was the beſt way to defend truth, and to recriminate others, the faireſt way to clear himſelf, juſtifying that Malefactor, who fell foul upon his Proſecutor, Judge, Jury, and Witneſſes, as the beſt way to ſave himſelf: And with the Chaced Fox, raiſeth a Duſt to make his eſcape. Dealing juſt with me, as the Heathens did with the Chriſtians of old, putting them into Bears Skins, and then ſet the Dogs upon them; or as the Papiſts have done with worthy Mr. Fox, for detecting their errors and cruelties, have decry'd him as ſuch a Forger, that none ought to converſe with him. But Mr. Wills will find himſelf under a diſappointment, truth is not ſo to be baffled, nor innocency foil'd, he will yet meet with a

Vindication of both, in his farther just detection and reproof.

These few Pages therefore do first truly discover to you, notwithstanding the great noise and clamour of mistakes, that the question discoursed betwixt us is certainly lost, and given up by him, and that the Antiquity so much boasted of is wholly for Believers, not Infants Baptism. With a serious and particular Answer to his groundless frivolous Appeal; discovering withall, that he is truly guilty of those crimes, and many more, that he would so injuriously father upon me, though what he discovers to have been my errors, I fully own, which are few, and very inconsiderable, mistaking 2 or 3 names one for another, viz. Aquinas *for* Albertus, Sericius *for* Hincmarus, *not hitting a Popes Name, and not taking* Walden *to so good advantage as I ought for my self; that of* Lanfrank *mentioned before, and which are all, of any weight, that I know of, none of them hurting us in the least, and and are so frivolous, that an ingenious man would scorn to have mentioned, much less to have made such a dust about.*

But in the mean time I must acknowledge, it is very sad the World should be troubled with such stuff, as though such accusations, recriminations, and discovery of nakedness, was for their edification, which I can truly say is very grieving to me, and were not the truth of God likely to suffer by my silence, I should rather have born his reproaches and slanders, than have made any return to him. And therefore what I have done on my part to prevent such mischiefs and inconveniencies, I think will be necessary to give you some particular account of, having before only given you a hint thereof, viz. how much I have endeavoured with Mr. Wills *to rectifie mistakes, and mis-understandings in a more Private, Friendly, Christian way, that we might save the world this unnecessary trouble.*

Know therefore, that my first Treatise of Baptism, having slept about 12 Months without any publick notice, and being ready to come forth with a 2d. Edition, I improved my utmost

interest with all sorts, to procure what Objections did rationally lye against it, that if I had committed any mistakes, I might rectifie them, having been constrained to take several things upon Trust, for want of opportunity to examine them by their Originals: And therefore did Apologize in my Preface for Candor, that if by the multitude of Quotations through so ancient a Track, they might find any particular mistake, mis-quotation, or mis-applicatoon, they would not so dwell or insist upon it, as to reject the truth of all the rest, that are full, and clear, and without exception, the way that Cavilers and Sophisters take, and the Method that Papists have all along taken in Reply to our Protestant Writers, though did assure, (and so I can say with a good Conscience) that I have not willingly given any such occasion, and truly at last, after all the malicious scrutiny, clamour and noise that has been made, it is matter of Admiration, that no more has been brought forth: Mr. Wills *having discovered but those few before mentioned: Mr.* Baxter *but one that had any significancy: And Mr.* Whiston *not one.*

Therefore hearing, That Mr. B. *had something to say against it, I ventured, as I have told you, to send to him; and understanding, that Mr.* Wills *had spent some time in the* Oxford *Library, to trace my Authorities, and found me tardy in many, I sent Two or Three Messages to him, to admit of some Converse about it, but in vain; then upon the coming forth of the* 2d. *Impression, I sent Mr.* Wills *one of them, with this following Letter.*

SIR,

I Understand you have some Exceptions against my Treatise of Baptism, especially the Historical Part, and particularly about the *Waldenses*, and that you intend speedily to print the same. I having, *Sir*, printed a 2*d*. Impression, and therein made some alterations, and very considerable additions, especially as to the *Waldenses*, have taken upon me the confidence to send you one; and which if it may tend to your satisfaction, may save the world, your self, and me, the further trouble of Answers and Rejoynders, if not, if you will please to Communicate where your principal

Objection

Objection lies, either to that, or any thing else, and admit of the Exchange of a Letter or Two about it; it may not be unserviceable to the Truth, with this assurance, that if it may appear, that I have done any manifest injury to truth, I shall be ready to give the most publick satisfaction it may call for; it having been my earnest and importunate desire, ever since the Exposure of the first, to procure any rational Objection against any thing I had said, and which should have been as welcome to me as an Approbation, (because it is only truth in sincerity I design to propagate) but do assure you, have not as yet met with the least Objection from any one that I had not before obviated. And indeed as to the Historical Part, though it is not offered for proof, but illustration only, would be too great folly to render any willful mistake, which every Scholar in his Library confutes; Which with the tender of Christian Respects, is recommended to your Consideration, by

Your unknown Friend and Servant,

H D.

March 22. 1673.

To which Letter upon the 10th of May 1674. *Mr.* Wills *returns me answer, that had not my Letter come too late, it would have been incivility not to have complied with me; but that part of his Book was in the Press before mine came to his hand, and therefore desired my excuse, and not to reckon him a willing disturber of the world, having never before invaded the Press.*

As though my Messages sent to him (by a neighbour of the Devizes, *and an acquaintance of his after, that came by him to* Bristoll Fair, *and several speakings to his Book-seller to write to him to that end, who still told me he staid the Press for my second Impression, having been ready for it some months) had no signification, if my Letter had not in time reach'd him, to prevent that disturbance, or at least to have obtained some Civil return from him.*

Well, the Book comes forth, and how stufft with prejudice, personal Reflections, egregious Mistakes, bitter Invectives not only against my self, and whole Party, but the Principle it self, you are best able to judge; which I endeavoured some time after, notwithstanding all those high provocations given, modestly to detect in a sober Reply.

Though

Though by the way this piece of Civility and Ingenuity must not be forgotten, that the week before my Reply was published, they thought meet to put Mr. Wills *Title into the Gazette, to proclaim me a Forger all the Nation over, knowing that though I might follow him in the Press, yet there I was not capable to attend him for my Vindication.*

Some months after mine came forth, I heard Mr. Wills *was come to Town with a Rejoynder: whereupon I sent some Friends to him to prevail for a Conference with him, which could not be obtained. Then I wrote to some of his Friends to acquaint him, that if he would meet with two or three Christian Friends of a side, and communicate to me his Exceptions, I should assure him, that if I had done him or the Truth any injury, I would make the most publick satisfaction that they should judge requisite; which could not prevail with him. Afterwards I hearing that he had been with my Book-seller, to read some writing of mine respecting the Controversie, which was shewed him, and supposing that might be some obligation to him to be reciprocal, did send my Book-seller to his to obtain the like freedom. to peruse his Papers in his Book-sellers hand, but could obtain no permission thereto.*

And yet after the rejection of all these modest endeavours of my part, which bespoke me far from being obstinate or tenacious in any thing that I had writ, he has the Confidence with this clap of Thunder he has come forth with, to tell the world in his Ep. to his Vindiciæ, That he must acquaint me that I having treated him with so much rudeness in what is past, that he had little heart to have any more to do with me, unless he see better cause, and gives me security of his Silence for the future, to any of my Contradictions, there being no gaping against an oven, and silence is accounted the best answer to such as superadd contumacy to their mistakes.

But where has that Contumacy appeared in me? It is true he deals with me in his appeal as a contumacious person, but

how

how such proceedings are to be reconciled to Reason, Rule, or Religion, I must confess my self at a great loss.

Had he dealt with me herein as the Quakers dealt with Mr. Hicks, *which he makes his pattern, he had been much more excusable, who (I presume he'l find) admitted of private conference, and had Letters exchanged betwixt them; and till they supposed Mr.* Hicks *was contumacious, and tenacious, did not proceed in that their Appeal.*

I do not know that it is the practice in Westminster-hall, *for a Plaintiff to procure publication for Tryal before he gives his Declaration, has his Answer, Reply, Rejoynder, &c. and surely Mr.* Wills *should have had so much patience to have attended what I had said to his* Vindiciæ, *before he had thundred out his Appeal: It may be my Answer to the former, might have prevented the latter. Will nothing satisfie him but my utmost shame and reproach? Yet would he perswade the world,* That he loves me as a Brother though erring, and had much rather convince then shame me, adviſing me to leave tossing the Ball of contention, *&c.*

But is this dealing with me like a Brother he designs to convince and reduce from errour? Is this to instruct with meekness? to use any Gospel-way to reform and inform, he knows the Soveraign Rule Mat. 18. *is not publickly to tell the Church, till all other private ways are ineffectual.*

I must confess these are ways and strains that I have not been acquainted withall, either amongst men or Christians, which only serve as to my own particular to lead me to Christs rule, which I desire more to attend in the case, To pray for him that thus despitefully uses and persecutes me, and to rejoyce that I am counted worthy to suffer shame, and to have all manner of evil spoken against me falsly for his Names sake.

Withall satisfying my self that Mr. Wills *takes the ready way by these methods to promote the cause he opposes, for few that ever I heard of, that manage a good cause, are left to such foul miscarriages.*

H. D.

The *Antiquity of Believers*, and *Novelty of Infants Baptism.*

CHAP. I.

Wherein the Antiquity of Believers, and Novelty of Infants Baptism is further confirmed; and that the Baptism after Faith was the only Baptism that was owned in the first Centuries, *to be Christs Ordinance and the Churches Practise, in full Answer to Mr.* Wills *his* Vindiciæ.

THE main question discussed between Mr. *Wills* and me, has been, whether the *Anabaptists* (so called) or the *Pædobaptists* have most to plead from *Antiquity* for their Way; *viz.* Those that only *Baptize* Men and Women after *Profession* of Faith and Repentance, or those that Baptize *Infants* that are capable of neither. The former of which I first asserted in my *Treatise*, and since defended, in my Reply to Mr. *Wills*, Mr. *Baxter*, and others, *viz.* That the *Anabaptists*, notwithstanding the great *Cry* to the contrary, have the *Antiquity* of their *side* for the first *Centuries*.

And which notwithstanding all the noise and clamour after the full discussion of that point on both hands, is now clearly manifested (if not by their own grants confirmed) to us. The which you may receive in the following brief *Account*.

CENT. I.

1. Cent. *gives Examples only for Adult Baptism.*

First it is most *manifest* as is confest on all hands, that the Scripture Story for the first *Century* gives us an account of no other Baptism, but that after Faith and Repentance, *viz.* Produceth Instances, or gives us Examples only for adult Believers, and not Infants Baptism; As we have observed the *Magdeburgs* themselves those *Pædobaptists* have so fully own'd acknowledging, *That they find Examples in the* 2, 8, 10, 16, 19. *of the Acts for the Baptizing of adult Believers, but of Baptizing of Infants they read of no Example* De Infantibus Baptizatis Exempla quidem non leguntur: To which Mr. *Wills* subscribes, acknowledging, *That there are no particular Examples for Infants Baptism upon Record*, p. 3. 53. vind. Mr. *Whiston* confessing *the same as generally* owned by them.

As for the Allegation, That the *Apostles Writings* do not expresly exclude Infants, as Mr.

Mr. *Wills* and Mr. *Whitston* from the *Magd.* affirm is so weak and frivolous, that needs no Reply, which would establish Baptizing of Bells, Chrysm, and what not of the Popish Inventions.

And that if not asserted in Scripture, is yet found in the Writings of *Origen* and *Cyprian* to have been the *Apostles* practise, is as utterly insignificant; for as it has, and will further appear to you they have writ no *such thing*; nor secondly if they *had*, would what they *writ* in the third Age, upon their single *Testimonies*, prove such a matter of *fact* in the first Age, when as 'tis confest the Scripture is wholly silent *therein*.

Therefore I hope it cannot be *denyed*, that for what appears in *Scripture Story*, our Enemies themselves being *Judges*, that *Antiquity* for the first *Century* is wholly on our side; so that no mention need be made of the Epistles of *Clement* and *Ignatius* in Confirmation thereof.

CENT. II.

SEcondly, as to the Second *Century* we find upon the fullest discussion, it *produceth* as few Examples for Infants Baptism, as the first, and that only those are mentioned to have been *Baptized in this Age*, that first

2. Cent. *gives Examples only for Adult Baptism.*

made *a profession of Faith*, and *Repentance*, as appears by that most remarkable account given us out of *Justin Martyrs Apology*, the most Authentick piece of *Antiquity* of this Age (not to mention what is said from *Dionysius*, and *Clem nt. Alexandrinus* Treat. p. 49, 50. which is not gainsaid by our *Antagonist*, only Mr. *Wills* would insinuate, that the *Magd.* did suppose, *That the Order* Justin Martyr *lays down*, *respected the reception of Aliens to Baptism*, which would not hurt us, because all are Aliens till Converted, no mention being made of any that were otherwise received. But *Justins* own words are full for satisfaction in the point, as *Treat p.* 49. viz. *I will declare unto you how we offer up our selves to God after we are renewed through Christ*, &c. Which respected the Order and Method observed by the *Saints* and *Believers* in the Church at that day, and how all of them had their *admission* therein.

So that for the first 200 *Years* we carry it, having Examples as is confest for *the one*, but none to be produced for *the other*: Whereby I should be sufficiently *justified*, (should we proceed no farther) in that *assertion* Mr. *Wills* so complains of, *p.* 2. *vind.* By affirming, That Antiquity it self is *altogether for Believers, and not for Infants Baptism.*

tism. For if it be manifest, that there be 200 Years for *the one* before *the other*, well may I say, That there is *Antiqity* for *the one*, and not for *the other*; for if *Antiquity* be writ upon *Believers Baptism*, *Novelty* then must needs be writ upon *Infants Baptism*. Nor but that I grant some that were called the *Ancient Fathers* of the 5*th*. Age, as *Austin*. *Chrysostom*, and others affirmed it; from whence Mr. *Wills* again and again upbraids me, and Mr. *Whitston* also, That I do contradict *my self*, in saying *Antiquity* was altogether for *the one*, and not for *the other*, they not considering, or *willingly omit* that I mean *Primitive Antiquity*; the Elder Brother was to carry away, as the *dignity* and *preheminency*, so the Inheritance from the Younger, much more the true *born*, from the base *born Child*.

CENT. III.

IN the 3*d*. *Century* we have as few *Examples* to be produced for *Infants Baptism*, as in the two *former*; but that they Baptized in this *Age* after the Profession of Faith, we have an ample account from *Tertullian*, *Origen* and *Cyprian*, and several others, as *Treat. p.* 51, &c. And which our Antagonists are so far from opposing, that they abun-

No Example for any but Adult Baptism in the 3. Cen.

abundantly confirm, *viz.* Mr. *Baxter*, in his *Saints Rest* p. 1. cap. 8. sect. 5. telling us, *That* Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, *who lived* (saith he) *in the* 2d. *and* 3d. Centuries, *do all of them affirm, That in the Primitive times none were Baptized without an express Covenanting, wherein they renounced the world, Flesh, and Devil, and engaged themselves to Christ, and promised to obey him.* And Mr. *Wills* also, 2. *part. p.* 6. of Infants Baptism, acknowledgeth, *That the* Magdeburgs *do tell us, That* Tertullian *in this age opposed himself to some that asserted Infants Baptism, affirming, That the Adult were only proper Subjects.*

So that it is manifest by what appears upon Record from any Authentick Story, that *Believers Baptism* carries the *Antiquity* of the Third *Century* also; there being not as yet one Infant upon Record that was actually Baptized, as any Ordinance of Christ, nor any thing appearing from good Authority by any Scripture Argument, that they ought so to be: What is pretended from *Origen* and *Cyprian* you have fully replyed to afterwards, and the utter insignificancy of any thing that is urged from them to this end, whilst you have full mouthed Evidence, and undeniable Authority for the other.

CENT.

CENT. IV.

AS to the 4*th. Century* it doth not yet appear when and where any Infant was Baptized, as an Ordinance of Christ; it is said indeed that some *Sick Children* were Baptized for their Health in this Age, and that some *Dying Children might be Baptized* to save them, as some other *Dying Persons* were; and that some *Doctors* in this Age enclined from *Circumcision* to bring it into the *Church*; but as yet none did pretend it to be necessary, none to have been a Precept of the Gospel, as Dr. *Taylor Treat. p.* 105. Whereas the Baptizing of Believers after the Profession of Faith, was the general practise of the Age, and which appears from the Three Substantial Instances given by me in my Treatise, especially in the Reply, *viz.* From 1. the *Sayings of Fathers.* 2. *Decrees of Councils.* 3. *Children of Believers unbaptized till aged*, p. 4, &c. 1. From the Sayings of the *Fathers*, and greatest Men of this *Century*, both in (*a*) *Affrica*, (*b*) *Asia*, and (*c*) *Europe*, asserting the necessity of Confession of Faith before *Baptism*, both from

Adult Baptism the general practise of the 4th. Age.

1st. *From the Sayings of the Fathers.*

(*a*) Athanasius *and* Arnobius. (*b*) Basil, Nazianzen, Eph. Syrus, Epiphanius. (*c*) Hillarii, Ambrose, Jerom, Marius Victorinus.

Christs

Christs *Commission*, Apostles *Practise*, and ends of the *Ordinance*.

Which Mr. *wills* little opposeth, only saith, *That some of these Doctors were corrupt in other things*, and so they were all, *That some of them* 3 *or* 4 *asserted Infants Baptism*; which I deny not, to save Dying Children; saith one of them, *viz.* Arnobius *was spurious from* Perkins; what then? the rest are *genuine*; and that *Arnobius* on the Psalms was ever Doubted is more *than I heard* before; but if he was, it signifies *nothing*; he also *Doubts* Basils *Proof*, urged by me *contra Eunomium*, which he calls for, and which he'l find *l.* 2. *p*, 24. viz. *Baptism is the Seal of Faith, but Faith is the confession of the Diety; for First he ought to believe, and after to be Sealed with Baptism.* Doubts *whether* Athanasius *is rightly rendred*, for which I give you my Authority = *That what is urged for the necessity of Faith to precede Baptism, respected the Adult*, very true: And *that some were for the Baptism of Infants, who were not capable to make Confession*; very true also; *Si aliquid periculi immineat*, If any danger happned otherwise, the necessity thereof from any precept of Christ was not yet enjoyed.

2. As

2. As to the 3 Councils, (*viz.* the *Carthaginian*, *Laodicean*, and *Neocesarian*) so positively decreeing, That *Teaching*, *Confession of Faith*, and *free choice*, ought to precede *Baptism*. He saith, *That these Decrees respected the Adult*; very true; therefore not Infants. *That the Council of* Carthage *and* Laodicea *Decreed also for Exorcism, and giving the Eucharist to dying Persons, and Penance* &c. What then, if they were corrupt in other things, were they not right here? Most of the *Fathers* were for these *Corruptions* also. And that as to the *Neocesarean Council* he saith, *He had as much cause to question, whether there was any such Council, as I had to question* Cyprians Council. But herein he will find himself much mistaken, whilst the *Magdeburghs*, Cent. 4 c. 9. p. 615. give the *Bishops Names* who sat in this *Council*, the *time* when it sat, *viz.* Immediately after that of *Ancyranus*, which *Helvicus* makes to be about the 10 or 12 of *Constantine*. Together with the 14 Canons of which this is one expresst at large, and which Dr. *Taylor* gives us in *the Original Greek*, *Determining as he saith, that none ought to be Baptized without giving an account of their Faith, and desiring the same*. Whilst Mr. *Wills* can neither produce from any *Ancient* and *Authentick Authority*, *when*, or

2. *Decrees of Council.*

where Cyprians *Council* sat, or what they *decreed* or *determined* in that *Council*, but what is pretended from that *Epistle*, which for its corruption is so much questioned, whereof more hereafter.

3 *From* 10 *of the most eminent men, not Baptized till aged.*

The 3*d*. Instance, *viz*. from 10 of the most eminent Men of the Age, who were not Baptized till aged, though the Children of Christian Parents, *viz*. *Bazel*, *Gregory*, *Nazianzen*, *Ambrose*, *Chrysostom*, *Ferom*, *Austin*, *Nectarius*, *Constantine*, *Valentinian*, and *Theodosius*. Concerning whom, excepting Two of them, *viz*. *Constantine* and *Austin*, he tells me *he will not contend with me*, *but for them he doubts whether their Parents were Christian*, yet denies not but that *Dr*. Taylor *and Mr*. Baxter *may have been of my mind*, whilst some others with himself have denyed it, which will be of great force with any considering persons; for if they had judged it an Ordinance of Christ, so many of the Chief of the Age would not so have neglected it.

In the next place Mr. *Wills* quarrels with some of my modern *Authors*, who speak the same thing, *viz*. *That in these first times none were Baptized without profession of Faith*, viz. *Strabo Rhevanus Rupertus Boemus* Dr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Baxter*, especially questions *Rhevanus* and *Rupertus* for Forgery; the first

first I grant you is not proper to prove only such were Baptized, that tearm only being not in it as in all the rest, but is no Forgery. As for *Rupertus*, 'tis no *Forgery*; the Treat. saith, They administred *Baptism* only to the *Children of the Church* at *Easter*; the Reply saith only the *Cathechumens*, which as I take it is one and the same, as it respects the *Children of the Church*, who it seems *were not Baptized till aged.*

But concerning Mr. B. and my abusing him, respecting his witness, that *Adult Baptism was the only necessary Baptism in these times*, take his own words so lately given us in his More Proofs, *p.* 279. viz. *Yet again I will confess, That the words of* Tertullian *and* Nazianzen *shew, but it was long before all were agreed of the very time, or of the necessity of Baptizing Infants before any use of reason, in case they were like to live to Maturity; for I am perswaded, that the Apostles and first Ministers were so taken up with the Converting of Infidels, Jews and Gentiles, that the case of Infant Baptism was so post-poned, and taken up as an Appendix to the Baptism of the Adult, as that it was thought less needful to give it a particular express mention in the Records and History of the Church.*

Mr. B's *full grant against the Antiquity of Infants Baptism.*

Thus Mr. *Baxters* own Pen has given himself the lye, and I just rebuke for all his vain *jangle* about the point of *Antiquity* for *Infants Baptism*, which now he is thus forc'd to confess there is no express mention in the *Records and History of the Church for*, and so also at once spoil'd all Mr. *Wills daubery*, and *silly Wranglings* about this point.

Therefore I hope it will not now be denyed us that the Anabaptists have the Antiquity on their side, not only for the first 200, but for the first 400 years, there being *nothing in the Records of Church History*, as is manifest, and confest to us also, to prove any *Infant was Baptized*, as a *Church Ordinance*, or that they ought in point of *necessity* so to be; and therefore there is no cause to question the truth of Dr. *Taylors*, and Dr. *Barlows* positive assertions in concurrence herewith, and in confirmation hereof remark'd to us: And it is worthy of consideration, that Dr. *Barlow*, in his Apologetical *Lr.* printed by Mr. *Wills*, doth not gainsay the Reason and Truth of what he formerly affirmed, but the indiscretion of writing, and unfaithfulness of printing the same.

CENT. V.

5 Cent. Brings in and imposeth the necessity of Infants Baptism.

THe Fifth *Century*, as we have at large proved *Treat. p.* 105, &c. brings in the necessity of *Infants Baptism* to *regenerate*, *take away* sin, and to *save the Soul* of the Infant, and that without which there was no *Salvation* to be had for them, grounded upon *John* 3. 5. as determined in the *Milevitan*, and afterwards in the *Carthaginian Councils*, by Pope *Innocentius*, afterwards confirmed by Pope *Zozimus*, and afterwards by Pope *Boniface*, &c. Never determined saith Dr. *Taylor*, till the Canon made in the *Milevitan Council*, so saith *Strabo*, *Luther*, *Grotius*, Treat. p. 107. which afterwards by degrees came *generally* to be received both *East* and *West*. Yet withall

withall this is most remarkable in the enjoyning thereof, that the *appointing of Gossips to confess faith, and profess repentance in the name and stead of the Child before Baptism*, and the practise thereof ever since to this our day, was a great Confirmation that the truth of the principle was owned, that Christ enjoyned in the Commission, requiring Faith should precede, and a Witness of the ancient practise of personal profession in the former Centuries. This Invention being found out purposely to answer the Commission: And therefore saith *Lud. Vives l. 1. c. 27. That none were Baptized of old but those of age, who did not only understand what the Water meant, but desired the same; the perfect Image whereof* (saith he) *we have yet in our Infants Baptism; for it is ask'd of the Infant, wilt thou be Baptized? for whom the Sureties answer, I will.* And so saith *Strabo* Treat. *p.* 63. and *Boemus* p. 73. And upon this account both *Austin, Chrysostom*, and the Doctors and Learned Men produced by me downwards through the Papacy to our day, spoke so much (from Christs Commission, and primitive Saints practise) for the necessity of Faith and Repentance before Baptism, only by their Sureties. And therefore did I so loudly call upon Mr. *Wills* to prove Gossips to be an appointment of Christ, or else to allow me all those Pædobaptists for proper Witnesses for Believers, and against Infant Baptism, and to free me from the many Forgeries he loaded me with for the same. But instead of doing himself and me right therein, he only returns thus to me, *p.* 45. *vind. Mr. Danvers brings Testimony for Adult Baptism from*

Gossips confirm the necessity of profession before Baptism.

Pædo-

Pædobaptiſts, and It ſeems a ſtrange deſign to all that I have ſpoken with about the ſame, that he ſhould offer to bring, Chryſoſtom, Auſtin, *&c. againſt Infant Baptiſm, ſo making the Fathers to contradict themſelves, and for which I rebuke him.*

Mr. Wills *declines anſwering the material point about Goſſips.*

But he takes much pains to vindicate himſelf, in which undertaking I find him ſo full of Meanders, and tedious Circumlocutions, that I judge it not worth the while to follow him.

By which his declining to anſwer ſo material a thing, we muſt take it for granted he cannot, and therefore muſt ſtill apply all *thoſe Authorities* from *Pædobaptiſts*, even from *Auſtin* to Mr. *Baxter*, in full Confirmation of the practiſe of the *Anabaptiſts*, in their Baptizing only after profeſſion, and in point blank *contradiction* to their own practiſe of Baptizing Infants, who are ſo uncapable either to anſwer the Commiſſion, primitive Saints practiſe, or the Spiritual ends of that great Ordinance, and ſo our whole Witneſs ſtands good, as not anſwered or owned by themſelves. As to what he ſaith reſpecting thoſe ſeveral falſhoods returned upon him; and the abſurdities made out againſt him about Tradition, from *p.* 51. to 83. I only deſire the Reader to examine the ſhortneſs and inſufficiency of his Anſwers by the Reply, from *p.* 29 to 79. it being not worth while to trouble them with his ſilly wranglings animated by partiality, as Mr. *B.* phraſes it. And it muſt be remembred to him that as to thoſe Stories about *John a Leyden*, for which he reflected ſo much obliquy upon the way of Anabaptiſtry; which was returned upon him, and his great error and ignorance in Story evinced with his malicious ſlan-

ders

ters and false reports he therein published, not only against the *Holland*, but *English* Anabaptists discovered to him: Concerning all which he makes no return and whose silence therein must be taken for his guilt, and bound upon him at least till he vindicate himself, or own his folly and injustice. As also in his saying nothing to the Arguments for dipping, against sprinkling or pouring, (about which he has made such a flourish heretofore) is because if he be not wholly convinced, yet that he is substantially silenced, and can say nothing thereto.

And lastly, as to what he has said against our Positive Witnesses against Infants Baptism, we must refer him to what is said to Mr. *Baxter*, after whose Copy he writes, and he having so fully granted us *Tertullian*, and *Mr. Baxter* having granted as before, that the *Beringarians*, *Wickliffians*, and *Waldenses* were against Baptizing Infants for Salvation, *Manichees* were expresly against it, who were no other than *Waldenses*. The whole of the Book stands yet firm and untouch'd, and most of it confirmed and established by their own Pens.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Some Objections about Origen *and* Cyprian, *and others, answered.*

1. Obj. MR. *Wills* tells me, *p.* 4. *That I silently pass by what the* Magdeburgs *do expresly say was in use in the* 3d. *age*, viz. *That adult Persons of both Sexes, and also Infants were Baptized*, Cent. 3. c. 6. p. 124.

Answ. That I have not past it by will easily be understood, when it is considered what I have said to the Authorities they give for the same in the said place, *Cent.* 3. *p.* 124. viz. *Origens Hom. on Leviticus, and Cyprians Epist. to Fidus*, neither of which proving, as I suppose, sufficient Authority upon the tryal to make good the same. The Words of the *Magdeburgs* are these, *Baptizabantur autem in utroq; sexu adulti simul & infantes, That adult Persons of both Sexes and Infants were Baptized. Nam de Infantibus Baptizandis Origines Homil* 8. *in leviticum, Ecclesiam ait traditionem accepisse ab Apostolis*: Et *Cyprianus* l. 3. Ep. 8. *For concerning the Baptizing of Children*, Origens 8 *Homily on* Leviticus *saith, That the Church received it as a Tradition from the Apostles, and* Cyprians 8 *Epistle in his* 3d. *Book to* Fidus. *Contra quod tamen etiam* Tertullian *censuit in lib. de Bapt. Notwithstanding* Tertullian *thought otherwise in his Book of Baptism*, (mind that.)

The

The Arguments brought from *Origen* and *Cyprian* have been examined at large in my *Treat. p.* 124. to 151. and further in the *Reply p* 84. to 97. where I prove that of *Origens* to be *Spurious*, and not only that upon *Levit.* and *Rom.* which Mr. *Wills* cannot now deny, [whereby the *Magdeburgs* proof is out of doors] but what he saith also upon *Luke*, with my grounds urged for the same from *Vossius*, *Sculletus*, *Erasmus*, Dr. *Owen*. (1) Because the Original is not extant. (2) Because what is therein pretended from *Origen*, *viz.* That Children must be Baptized to take away Orignal sin, (so contrary to his own judgment) he being the head of the *Arrians*. Therefore how fair this is for Mr. *Wills* to boast of this Antiquity, and yet decline Answering to their Arguments, I leave all Men to judge. Who is pleased without any one word of Answer to that which is so positively said to enervate what is pretended for *Luke*, yet in a scurilous and pedantick way to say *p.* 93 *Vind. We see by what is said, That we have Infants Baptism owned, as from the Apostles, by* Origen *on* Luke, *what ever becomes on the* Romans, *and translated by* Jerom, *&c. So that the Fabreck stands yet upright, never like to be demolish'd by* Mr. Danvers, *what ever great Exploits he hath done heretofore in the days of his Collonelship.*

1. Origens *Testimony examined.*

Concerning which proof from *Origen*, you have Dr. *Taylor* in his liberty of Prophecy, *p.* 237. Thus, *viz. None of the reformed Churches can pretend this Argument for this opinion: Because they who reject Tradition, when it is against them, must not pretend it in the least for them; but if*

D. Taylors *full witness against* Origens *Testimony.*

the Topick be allowed to be good, yet how will it be verified? For so far as can yet appear, it relies wholly upon the Testimony of Origen, *for from him* Austin *had it, a Person whom all other Ages have condemned of Errors, and whose works have been judged so spurious.* &c.

And that it was the opinion of the Primitive Church, That Infants ought not to be Baptized, is cleer, saith he, in the Canon of the Council of Neocesaria, *determining, that none ought to be Baptized without giving an account of their Faith, and desiring the same.* And agreeable hereto witnessing the rhe Doctor, spoke fully his own sence herein, take that parallel passage writ in one of his last pieces, in his *Dissuasive against Popery*, writ 1667. *viz. That there is a Tradition to Baptize Infants relies but upon Two Witnesses,* Origen *and* Austin, *and the latter having received it from the former, it relies wholly upon a single Testimony, which is but a pittiful Argument to prove a Tradition Apostolical, he is the first that spoke it, but* Tertullian *that was before him seems speak against, which he would not have done, if it had been a Tradition Apostolical, and that it was not so, it is but too certain, if there be any Truth in the works of* Lud. Vives, *saying, that anciently none were Baptized but Persons of riper Ages.*

2. Cyprians *Testimony further examined.*

Then as to *Cyprians Ep.* to *Fidus*, (which is so much lean'd upon, the other proving but a broken Reed) supposing there was such a Council; (which yet no Author can tell us when, and where held, and what therein determined) and that this Epistle was genuine, (against which I have much to say, *Stephens, Daylle, Erasmus,* and others proving how much his

his Works as well as *Origens* have been abused, and things fathered upon him that were never his) yet the erronious grounds upon which Infants Bahtism is asserted therein, takes away the *Credit* and *Authority* of the said Council, determining as one well saith *Childrens Baptism, by such Childish Reasons.*

But the matter of Fact say they is clear, which witnessed, that the Church had then such a *practise*, and which all our three Adversaries much insist upon,

As to matter of Fact in Antiquity, (if this should be granted, of which I see not much cause, for at best it was but advice, and that upon erroneous grounds too, no President as yet apparing in the Case) it would signifie little to create a practise from it. For that Children were Baptized for *health*, and Church Walls were also solemnly Baptized for dedication, and after that Bells *&c.* cannot be denyed, shall we therefore be warranted to do the like from those Presidents? But in as much as here was no Example, or matter of Fact, nor any advice but upon corrupt and erroneous *grounds*, this can signifie nothing; the grounds of the advice being rejected by the *Pædobaptists*, therefore the advice it self as to matter of Fact is rejected be them also; all that can be gathered from it, if true, is only that such a Custom was creeping in. We know giving the *Sacrament* to Infants is supposed to be very *ancient*, and continued very long in use 600 years, saith *Maldonat* on *Jo. 6.* and that amongst the *Greeks* as well as *Latins*, assisted by *Austin*, *Innocent*, & others, (if not by *Cyprian* also) & that it was *Apostolical*, or foun-

ded upon the Scriptures, but is not that rejected?

But holy Cyprian, *saith Mr.* Baxter, *tells us, as* p. 276. *More Proofs*, was *an eminent worthy, a great Father and Pillar of the Church, and ought not to be slighted.* Yet by his leave Father *Cyprian* was not Father *Paul*, nor any *Apostle to us*, nor doth he give us any warranty from the *Word of God*, and Christs Precept to ground such a practise upon, but the *contrary*, and that which *Pædobaptists* now a days reject, as very erroneous. And if he tells us, we should do any thing as Apostolical without a word, we must give as little credit to him, as when he tells us, *Chrysm* is so, (which the *Magd.* tell us he doth, *Cent.* 3. *p.* 82. out of *Cyprian*, l. 1. Ep. 12. though Mr. *Wills* denies the same) or as when he tells us of *the necessity of Exorcisms, the Authority of* Peters *Chair, Alms to take away sin, that the Administrator gives the Spirit in the act of Baptism*, of *Rebaptization*, by undoubted Councils confirmed. *Perfusion of the Clinici, Diluting of Wine*, or *mingling Water with it* in the Sacrament *&c.*

I have been the larger upon these Two, *Origen* and *Cyprian*, because my Three Antagonists, and others, do lay so much stress upon them, to prove their Antiquity from, but how little they signifie you now see.

An Appeal to the Learned.

Thus we have ended the point of Antiquity; and which we shall conclude with an Appeal to the Learned of all perswasions, **Whether there is not good cause to write Antiquity upon Believers, and Novelty upon Infants Baptism**; Nothing more appearing for it for the Four first *Centuries*, than has yet been brought forth by our opposites, And so much for the *Antiquity of Believers Baptism.*

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Gives answer to Mr. Wills *his Appeal in all the parts of it.*

THe better to help the *Appellants* (*viz.* the *Baptists*) to give a righteous judgment in the matters brought to their Barr, by Mr. *Wills* in his Appeal: And for the satisfaction of all men, I do hereby joyn issue with him in the candid examination thereof.

Mr. Wills *his Appeal to the Baptists, as you find, consists of* 8 *Complaints, the which I distinctly answer as followeth.*

1. His first Complaint against me is, *For leaving out part of what my Authors say, to make the Sentence more for my purpose; and for which he gives six Instances.* 1. *Prevarication.*

In Reply whereto, I first say in general, That in the quoting of Authors we are obliged to give only what they speak to the thing in hand, without unnecessary repetitions. And therefore Mr. *Wills* in his own case, when I blamed him *p.* 48. *Reply*, for leaving out part of that remarkable Sentence out of *Nazianzen, viz.* where he brings him to affirm, *That a Child may be Baptized*, leaving out the next words, *si aliquid periculi immineat, if any thing of danger happened.* And in Excuse thereof is pleased *Answered.* 1. *Generally.*

to

to make the following return *Vind. p. 7.* viz. *That I do exclaim against him for Curtailing that Father. but* (saith he) *the Judicious Reader may understand, that he quarrels at me without cause; for my business was to prove, That Infant Baptism was owned in that Century as to matter of Fact; and not to discover the ground of it, or to enquire in what Cases it was done; and therefore he might have spared his frivolous Charge about that matter.*

Which Rule of his own, however it may serve to relieve him for leaving out that passage, (which I doubt, and is not now my business to dispute) to be sure it will justifie me in all the 6 Particulars charged upon me under this head. Yet this by the way, as to the reason of his omitting that passage; *because*, saith he, *in the former words the matter of fact is to be made good*, (*viz.* That Infant Baptism was own'd in this Century) *is manifest.* But he knows the Question is not, Whether an Infant might be Baptized; for at another time he can tell us, *That every Baptism is not the Baptism intended, but only that which is done in Christs way in obedience to his Rule.* So that if a Child was Dipt, which it might be accidentally by chance, or occasionally upon some emergency, or Medicinally to cure Diseases, (as some were in this Age) or superstitiously to save its dying Soul, which was onely the fancy intended in this place, (and therefore should not have been omitted, for spoiling the scope) it would signifie nothing, being no Baptism of Christs appointment, the matter of fact being only to be made out, when the necessity of such a practise

in

in obedience to Christs Command in performing a Gospel Ordinance is proved. And which Mr. *Baxter* grants us, was not as yet to be proved by any Church Record; and never till the *Milevitan Council*, saith Dr. *Taylor*.

In the next place, for your better satisfaction, I shall speak to each Particular: And, 2ly *Particularly.*

First, as to the quotation out of *Daille l.* 2. p. 149. mentioned *Treat. p.* 62. My business was therein to discover, That the Ancients deferred Infants Baptism, therefore I gave the several Instances from him of those who had their Baptism deferred till aged, *viz. Ambrose, Nazianzen, Bazil*, &c. who appear undeniably to have been the Children of Christian Parents, and *that it was*, as he saith, *the opinion of some of the Fathers, That it is fit Infants Baptism should be deferred: And how comes it to pass, that there is not the least tracing or footing of this Custom in the Church of* Rome. *Nay, whence is it besides, that they will not so much as endure the very mention of it, and would abhor the Man that should go about to practise it*, (the Truth whereof we find also, and feel) *&c.* 1. *About* Dailles.

But saith Mr. *Wills*, *Daille* mentions the deferring the Baptism of other people also, and why did I leave that out? For the Reason Mr. *Wills* gives, because it was not so much *ad rem.* Though if I had, it would have done him no service, if *Daille* understood himself, who refers us to what he had before spoken about it, which we find in *p.* 72. where he tells us, *That some were of opinion, That elder People should be deferred Baptism, as well as Infants, agreeing therein, saith he, with the Anabaptists*, (which indeed

deed is our Custom, waiting for fruits meet for Repentance in the first place, so deferring elder as well as younger.

2. *The Canon of the Council of* Constant.

And as to the Second, about the Canon of the Council of *Constant.* I find upon search, that though the 2*d* Chapter, referred to by the *Magd.* and Mr. *Wills* mentions no more then what follows, *viz. Si parvulus ægrotans ad quemlibet Presbyterum Baptismi gratia de cujuslibet parochia allatus fuerit, ei Baptismi Sacramentum nullo modo denegetur; siquis hoc munus petenti concedere detrectaverit, & ille parvulus absq; Baptismi gratia mortuus fuerit noverit ille qui eum non Baptizavit pro ejus anima rationem redditurum.* Yet the 7*th.* Chapter which neither point to, expresses what Mr. *Wills* repeats from the *Magd.* about it; and withall, it does now appear also, that that 7*th.* Chapter is one of the 9 *Binius* reckons to be spurious, in these words, *Hi novem sequentes Canones falso adscribuntur sextæ Synodo; sed quia pij cum primis esse videntur noluimus curiosum Lectorem eorum cognitione fraudare.* Bin. Tom. 5. p. 361. And therefore upon the whole, though it be sufficient to clear me, that the omitting the exception in that place was not with an intention to deceive, having in my Book twice mentioned it; yet I acknowledge it should have been exprest, or rather the whole quotation omitted, and do now disown it.

3. *That out of* Calvins Institutes.

Thirdly, As to that passage out of *Calvins Institutes,* wherein I bring him *p.* 91. *Treat.* to confess, *That it is no where expresly mentioned by the Evangelists, that any one Child was by the Apostles hands Baptized;* which he intimates,

was

was not *Calvins* sence, but expreſt by him to have been the objection of Fools, the which Mr. *Wills* might bluſh to mention, when he knows *Calvin* himſelf to own it as the next words expreſs, *viz. Et ſi enim id nominatim ab Evangeliſtis non narratur*, i. e. *For although it is not by the Evangeliſts expreſly mentioned*: And is not that the making it his own? Concluding that their folly only lay in not receiving it, equivalent with Scripture, in as much as Infants were not excluded by Scripture, and that whole Families are mentioned to be baptized: And therefore whether Mr. *Wills* did fairly in ſtopping his Tranſlation where he did (that it might appear to thoſe that underſtood not Latin to be ſo groſs as he would make it, and thereby render himſelf to be guilty of the very thing he falſly accuſeth me of, *viz.* To leave out part of the Author, that diſcovers he ſpeaks quite otherwiſe than he is made to ſpeak, *Rom.* 2. 1.) is ſubmitted to his Conſcience, and the conſiderate Reader.

Guilty of what he accuſeth.

Fourthly, As to what he complains to have been left out in *Bellarmin*, viz. *That Infants Baptiſm was to be deduced out of Scripture*, p. 95. and that out of Dr. *Field*, *That the grounds of it were taken out of Scripture*, p. 155, 1. E 1. were alſo omitted from his own grounds aforeſaid: Becauſe I there quoted both of them under the Head of Tradition, (they both with ſo much poſitiveneſs aſſerting Infants Baptiſm ſo to be) yet you'l find, that when I ſpeak to that Head of *Conſequences* from Scripture, I quote them both, as Reply, *p.* 74.

4*ly.* Bellarmine, *and* 6. Dr. Field.

Laſtly, Dr. Owens.

And *laſtly*: As to that of Dr. *Owen*, p. 175.

which with *Estius*, *Ainsworth* and *Ames*, I brought to prove the Seed of *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 7. respected the Spiritual Seed only, *viz.* the Elect, who were to partake of the Spiritual Promises, (and not the Carnal Seed, as Pædobaptists generally take it,) which the Dr. doth so fully and at large evince: And therefore that Clause he excepts against, was by his own Rule well enough left out, that speaks to another thing. Though I confess, had I suppos'd that the omitting it, would have been any injury to the Dr. or just offence to any man, or any wrong to truth I should have mentioned it, and which I may well do without any prejudice to the cause I maintain. For if I had been to prove that Circumcision, that External Administration of the Covenant which the *Jews* had, belonged to their Carnal Seed, I should have mentioned that; but in as much as the other was the matter in hand, I know not that it was so hainous to omit it, Mr. *Will* in his own Case being Judge. It is our belief that (as the Dr. says) *the external Administration of the Covenant*, *viz.* Circumcision *did belong to* Abraham, *and his Carnal Seed* (the Jews) under the legal Administration; yet it follows not therefore, that Baptism belongs to his Carnal Seed under the Gospel Dispensation. And therefore the omitting that Phrase, which is not at all disputed betwixt us, could not be from any injurious design. And therefore I conceive I deserve not the severe rebuke, he is pleased to give me for the same, *viz.* *That I* ☞ *am therein guilty of much dishonesty, and that it is such an unworthy carriage, that he never ob-*

served

ferved the like in any man. Though truly if I hould have put it in, I know not what advantage Mr. *Wills* could make of it at another time, except he concludes, that the ſame ſe leral right o the Carnal See l, is continued under the Goſpel, as it was under the Law, and gives he ſame right to claim the ſame priviledges ow, as that did to the *Jews* before: If ſo, urely *John Baptiſt* did greatly miſtake himſelf, when he forbad them *Baptiſm* upon that conſideration, & bids them not to ſay within themelves, that they were the Children of *Abraam*, for that muſt not now ſerve their turns, being only Fruits meet for Repentance, that hat muſt qualifie them for the Baptiſm of Reentance, (and Goſpel-Ordinances and Priviedges) and not their old Carnal Priviledge to e *Abrahams* fleſh y Seed, in which they mainly oaſted, & whereon they bolſte ed themſelves. And ſuitable hereto doth Dr. *Owen* himſelf very excellently tell us in his 6. *Exercit*, on the *Heb.* p. 56 *Tom.* 1. viz.

That the miſapprehenſion hereof was the main thing that confirmed the Jews *in their obſtinacy and unbelief, that being only a peculiar Priviledge to that fleſhly Seed, for the bringing forth of the Meſſiah into the World, and that when he was come, that Priviledge fell, and all Ordinances ſuited thereto, expired, and new Ordinances of Worſhip more ſuitable to the Goſpel were appointed,* &c. That whole *Exercitation* being written with ſo much *Judgement* and Spirituality, I would earneſtly recommend it to Mr. *Wills*, and Mr. *Whiſtons* Conſiderations, and all other of their minds, who would, upon like miſapprehenſions, have

have Gospel-Ordinances and Priviledges still entailed upon the fleshly Seed, upon that old federal right which was only Typical, as well observed to us, and done away, (having done its business) when Christ came into the world, that greater Priviledges and better Ordinances suited to the Gospel dispensation might take place. Jesus Christ as the Dr. so well tells us in his *Cat. p.* 106. *Requiring Regeneration as an indispensible condition in a Member of his Church, a Subject of his Kingdom: For his Temple is now to be built of Living Stones*, 1 Pet. 2. 5. *viz. Men spiritually and savingly quickned, from their Death in sin by the Holy Ghost, (whereof they are partakers) made a meet Habitation for God*, Eph. 2. 21, 22. 1 Cor. 3. 16. 2 Cor. 6. 16. & pag. 103. *God hath appointed Saints to be the seat and subject of all his Ordinances, having granted the right of them to them alone*, 1 Tim. 3. 15. But this by the By, which may not be unseasonable upon this occasion. Thus I have dispatch'd the first Head, not doubting but I have given ample satisfaction therein.

Adding to Authors.

II. His Second Complaint against me is, *for adding to Authors without the Distinction of a different Character, whereof he gives seven Instances.*

Answered. 1. Generally.

This is a Charge that I think may concern most Writers, and 'tis confess'd, that many times it falls out, that through the inadvertency of *Writers*, or carelessness of *Printers*, that *Quotations* out of Authors are not alwayes written in a different *Character*, whereby the Rea-

Reader is at a loss many times, whether he reads his *Author*, or another Man that he refers to: And which is the fault, as Mr. *Wills* knows, of the *Magdeburgs*, of the *Bazil* Impression, and the fault of Mr. *Wills* his present Book, which I could abundantly evidence, if I would be Critical, and trouble the Reader with such Impertinencies. And wherein any such omission has been in any of my Writings, I can truly say they have not been wilful, but my trouble to find, and of which I shall be more careful for the future, and so will I hope my Corrector. But to be more particular to your 7 Instances, viz:

2. *Particularly.*

Those Two added to the *Magdeburgs* are truly their own, though not so immediately following in that Page. That other of *Chrysostom* was purely my own and should have been distinguished. That which he calls my adding to *Jerom*, positively saying they are none of his words, though I tell you, that he saith it is, is Mr. *Wills* his gross mistake; for he will find they are his own words in his *Annot.* upon *Mat.* 28. *Tom.* 9. *Edit. Paris*, *Anno* 1546. viz. *Non enim potest fieri ut corpus Baptismi recipiat Sacramentum, nisi ante anima fidei susceperit veritatem*, i. e. *For it cannot be, that the Body should receive that Sacrament of Baptism, till the Soul hath before received the verity of Faith.* That to *Lydia* is not an adding to the *Scripture*, but my own sense of the words, concluding, that only Believers in her Houshold were Baptized, of which I speak at large in my *Reply*, p. 184. That to *Beza's* is easily understood not to be his, by any ordinary Reader. And that to

Ames very plainly. But what Injury done herein, and what the obstinacy calling for an Appeal, is left to all to judge.

Forgery. III. The Third Complaint is, *For making Authors affirm one thing, when they affirm the directly contrary, yea, contradicting myself.*

Answered. 1. *About Estius.* 1. The first he mentions, is that of *Estius* for *Calvin*, heretofore owned by me, which savours nothing of Ingenuity, though in looking into my Book, I find I am not altogether so tardy as I took my self to be; for whoever pleases to look *p.* 176. in theen I of that Quotation, will find that I put *Estius Ann. Gen.* 17. 7. and by what mistake *Calvin* came to be mentione! in the beginning of it, I know not, therefore how fair Mr. *Wills* was in that Cavil, and since, by his unmerciful inculcating the same, is left to the Reader.

2. *Dr. Hamond on Joh.* 13. 10. 2. The second is, for mistaking, (as he saith) a Quotation out of Dr. *Hamond*, quite contrary to wha he affirms, with his remark upon it *viz. No wonder Mr. D mistakes Latin Authors so often, when he cannot rightly understand those that are in English.* But what cause there is for the same, and that it ought rather to be turned upon himself, will appear by the following Paralel.

Dan.

Treat. 194. Dr. Hamond on Joh. 13. tells us, that Βαπτισμὸς signifies an Immersion, or washing the whole body, and which answereth to the Hebrew word טבילה used for dipping in the Old Testament.	Dr. Hamonds *Ans.* on *Joh.* 13. 10. printed for R. Royston, 1653 *The* Heb. *had their* Βαπτισμὸς *or* λόσεις, *and their* νίψεις *the former*, (viz. Βαπτισμὸς) *washing of the whole body, which they call* טבילה, *the other of the hands or feet, which they call* קדוש, *sanctifying.*	Mr. *Wills* saith, that Dr. *Hamond* saith, *The* Heb. *had their* λόσις, *and their* Βαπτισμὲς, *or* νίψεις, *the former (that is* λόσις*) the washing of the whole body, which they call* רחיצה, *the other two (that is* Βαπτισμὸς *and* νίψις*) of the hands or feet.*

And then has the confidence to say, Mr. *D.* us, *the Dr. saith* Baptismos *signifies an Im-*rsion, *or washing of the whole Body, and answers the Hebrew word* טבילה, *whereas indeed he tells That* λόσις *signifies the washing of the whole dy, and answers to* טבילה.

Now that this was exactly agreeable to the Drs. ritings elsewhere in the said Book, as well as e truth, the Reader is desired to peruse him on *Mark* 7. 4. p. 172. where he saith, *That word* Βαπτίζεσθαι (*as it differs from* νίπτεσθαι *which belongs to the hands or feet*) *signifies washing of the whole body. Thus 'tis said of* polis (*which wrote the Tragedy called* Baptæ *inst* Alcibiades) *that being taken and thrown the Sea* ἐβαπτίζετο, *and so the Baptisms of*

Cups, &c. *in the end of this Verſe is putting in water all over, rincing them: Two words ther are uſed by the Hebrews for waſhing.* 1. קדושין *the word uſed for waſhing hands and feet onely, th* νίπτειν *here; And* 2. טבילה *immerſion of the whol body, to which* Βαπτισμοὶ *anſwers.* And upo *Mat.* 3. 1. p. 14. *As the Jews call thoſe Lake wherein they waſh themſelves* κολυμβήθρας, *ſo in th Chriſtian Church the* Βαπτιστήριον, *or Veſſel whic contained the Baptiſmal Water is oft called* κολυμβήθρα, *a ſwimming or diving place.*— And fur ther, *John in token of the reſolved change of th Jews, put them into the Water, and dipt them all over, and ſo took them out again; And upo the ſincerity of their change, promiſed them re miſſion of ſins.* And now whether it be Mr *Wills* or I that have abuſe Dr. *Hamond*, is ſub mitted to the unprejudiced Reader.

3. *About the Popes Name* Deus dedit.

As to the Third I grant, *Deus dedit* appear ing to me two words, and not the Name of Man; I rendred it *Deo dans*, or God's gift, no conſidering, as Mr. *Wills* obſerves, that ther had been a Pope of that Name, which ſince find in the Catalogue of Popes, and therefor acknowledg it to be my error.

4. *Quotation out of* Walden.

Fourthly, as to the Quotation out of *Walden* I acknowledge Mr. *Wills* hath truly rectified t our advantage, which confirms more fully, tha *Wickliffe*, and his followers, were againſt In fants Baptiſm, in agreement with the *Albegoi* and *Sylveſter* in *Scotland*, though differe from *Pelagius* and *Vicentius Victor*, which wa my miſtake, who (as it is ſaid) held Infan Baptiſm, and thereby reproved himſelf for a aſſerting the quite contrary, *viz. That* Walde

affirm

affirms, *That* Wickliffe *held Infants Baptism*, p. 45. of his *Vind.*

The words of *Walden* relating to *Wickliffe* are, *Nostri Wicliviste Baptismum Ecclesiasticum inutile judicant parvulis*, which [*parvulis*] Mr. *Will's* very unworthily leaves out, to insinuate to his Reader, that they rejected all Baptism, whereas that term expressly limits it to little ones; nor can I seriously conjecture, but its rather *a lapsus mentis* then *error Calami* or *Typographi*: Nor does he take notice of the reason assigned there for their denying Infants Baptism, which is the very same Mr. *Wills*, and those of his mind, produce for its practice, *viz. sufficienter eos aiunt esse mundatos & sanctos, quia de sanctis parentibus & Christianis nascuntur*, i. e. *They deem them sufficiently cleans'd and holy, because they are born of Holy and Christian Parents.* And now whether Mr. *Wills* his Curtailing this Quotation, or my harmless and unndesigned mistake of asserting *Wickliffe* to agree with *Pelagius* be the more blameable, I humbly submit to consideration.

The Fifth is no contradiction, which is only an Allusion to those in *Ezra's* time that put away their strange Wives, Similies not running of all four, as Mr. *Wills* would stretch it. 5. *That of* 1 Cor. 7. 14

The Sixth is no Contradiction, for Infants Baptism might be universally received, and yet in many places little esteemed, has it not been so heretofore here in *England*, as to that as well as other things I could mention? 1. Because persons may little esteem things they receive. 2. By universal, I explain my self to mean the Greek and Latin Churches, (which admitted 6. *Quotation out of* Frank.

of

of exception) *viz.* Those that submitted to the Pope, and those that were under the Patriarchs.

7. An Assertion of my own. The Seventh is no Contradiction, which in the former Chapter I have so fully cleared; there being Antiquity for Believers Baptism in the first Centuries, but no Record for Infant Baptism, as Mr. *Baxter* grants, in the Church Histories. So that no primitive Antiquity for the same, though the Ancients in after Ages did assert it.

So that what exceptions he has made hitherto, are but slender, and not of that Moment, nor so persisted in, as to deserve an Appeal.

False Translation. IV. He chargeth me with *perverting the sence of Authors by the falseness of Translations, whereof he gives Nine Instances.*

Answered. 1. Generally. As to Translations, I conceive there is a great liberty allowed, provided the scope and intention of the Author be well heeded; and therefore saith Mr. *Marshal* in his *Defence*, p. 16. *Translations are various, some affect in their Translations to follow their Author* Kata poda, *to have the very foot-steps of the words they translate; other Translations are Metaphrastical, or by way of Paraphrase they expound as they translate; thus several men have their several fancies though they adhere to to the Author which they translate, even when they keep not in all things to his words;* Jerom *gives Instances in the Septuagint translations, whose Testimony I need not name to you.* But to the particulars.

As to the *first* of *Bullingers*, I did not translate it, but transcribed it word for word out of that Author, called, *A very plain and well grounded Treatise concerning Baptism*, p. 14. mentioned by me p. 9. It is true, I confess, I should have expresst it, or rather have search'd the original my self, and so should Mr. *Wills*, when he so mistakenly quoted one from Dr. *Holmes*, and did neither, and another from the *Magdeburgs* about *Erasmus*. 2. *Particularly.* 1. Bullingers.

As to the Second, about *Nazianzen*, *Baptizandos peccata sua confiteri solitos*, I own it should be rendred, *The Baptized were wont to confess their sins*. Nor did I I give it as a translation, *verbatim*; but what I apprehended to be the consequential sence, which I deduce thus: [the *Baptized*] being an indefinite term, and equipolent with an universal, is as much, as if all the Baptized did so; and if all did confess their sins, then none but such were Baptized in the first times, which is concurrent with the sence of so many Authors, so positively affirming the same thing; and if that be not the meaning, I humbly conceive the expression (otherwise understood) may be somewhat impertinent, it being owned of all hands, that the Adult in all Ages so to do. 2. Nazianzen.

The Third is of *Olympiodorus*, a meer quibble, and catching at words; the word [Born] by the words going before, *viz.* Spiritual Life, being easily understood to be [born again] however the word [again] came to be omitted. 3. *Olympiodorus.*

The Fourth of *Albertus*, is of like Import; or if Baptism cannot through the incapacity of the subject operate upon them, it may be truly 4. *Albertus*

said

said in a Paraphrastical Translation, That it is not proper to admit Infants thereto: For if it cannot operate in any other but the Adult, who are illuminated and called, who can draw Virtue from Christs Death and Resurrection, then Baptism not proper for other.

5. *Albinus.* Neither is the Fifth from *Albinus* ill rendred or perverting the sence if you take the scope, and former words, which speak the thing he excepts against; and which Mr. *Wills* leaves out, a liberty being granted to paraphrase, keeping to the sence, though contracting the words.

The Sixth is no perverting or mis-representing the *Magdeb.* in saying, They tell us, That in the latter end of the Fourth *Cent.* they Baptize Children, giving it from the testimony of *Athanasius*, who writ in the latter part of the 4*th. Cent.* That *Contra Arianos* being writ, as saith *Helvicus*, *Anno* 360 But I have since made appear, that the *Magdeb.* tell us therein an untruth; for that pretended account was from *Athanasius's* supposed Questions, which they themselves afterwards confess to be spurious, as I have told Mr. *Wills*, and he confesseth to be true, and therefore wonder, that he should have the Confidence to put this under the notion of mis-representation, or mis-translation, it being neither. Had I given a translation of the former part of the sentence, respecting *Origen* and *Cyprian* (before refuted by me, and which I concern'd not with my self, then) and not rende'd [in *Ecclesiis Affricanis*] in the *African* Churches, there might be some ground of *Cavil*; but whereas I did not, I hope I may be excus'd. The words are, *Hoc vero seculo eun-*

dem

dem [viz. Baptiſmum] *duraſſe ex* Athanaſio *conſtat, quæſt.* 124. i. e. *It appears from* Athanaſius 124 *queſtion, that it* (viz. Infant Baptiſm) *was in this Age.* So that what I ſay reſpects the time, and not whether all or part of the *Affrican* Churches. But if to ſay in the *Affrican* Churches they Baptized Children, pleaſes Mr. *Wills*, I am contented it ſhould be ſo; and let him make the moſt of it.

7. *About the* Milevitan *Canon.*

The 7*th.* concerning the *Milevitan* Decree, viz. That firſt part of the Canon, *That all that affirm, that young Children receive Everlaſting life, albeit they be not by the Sacrament of Grace or Baptiſm renewed.* I made it not, nor abuſed that Council, nor miſ-tranſlated their words, for in the Veſſe before going, as the *Magdeburgs* expreſs it, *p.* 835. they repreſent the crime of thoſe they cenſure in theſe words, *Non opitulari parvulis ad conſequendam vitam Æternam Chriſtianæ gratiæ Sacramentum*, viz. *That the Sacrament of Criſtian Grace* (or Baptiſm) *profits not little Children to Everlaſting Life.* The ſame alſo is expreſt by the whole Council to *Innocentius*, in their Synodical Epiſtle, *p.* 842. in theſe words, *pueros quoq; parvulos ſi nullis innoxios, & gratiæ Sacramentis, habituros vitam Æternam.* The ſame is alſo in *Innocents Decretal Letter*, p. 845. *which he returned to the Council* in theſe words, *Illud vero quod eos veſtra fraternitas aſſerit prædicare, parvulos Æternæ Vitæ præmijs, etiam ſine Baptiſmatis gratia, poſſe donari perfatuum eſt*; And to meet with thoſe Hereticks, (as they counted them) was the decree I mentioned, made, and which is to be found in *Regia Collect. Tom.* 4. p. 559. immediately after the words recited

by Mr. *Wills ex pervetuſto codices*, out of a very ancient Copy, thus. *Item placuit, ut ſiquis dicit ideo dixiſſe Dominum, in domo patris mei manſiones multæ ſunt, ut intelligatur, quia in regno Cælorum erit aliquis medius, aut ullus alicubi locus, ubi beate vivant parvuli, qui ſine Baptiſmo ex hac vita migrarunt, ſine quo in regno Cælorum quod eſt vita æterna intrare non poſſunt Anathema ſit*; and which is the very thing I affirmed: and therefore I hope will juſtifie me from this Charge, giving onely an Epitome, and not the whole of the Decree, out of the Decretals themſelves, not the *Magdeburgs*. 'Tis true, the Canon has not this *Appendix* to it, where recited by the *Magdeburgs*, nor in *Reg. Collect.* p. 362. though properly belonging to it; but where the *African* Canons are *collected, repeated*, and *confirmed* under *Cæleſtinus* Pope, and *Theodoſius* Emperor, *Anno* 424. it is annext. And then this 2*d*. Canon of the *Milevitan Council*, with this annexed, is made the 77*th African* Canon. And I muſt further inform the Reader, that the *Magd.* confounded theſe two *Milevitan* Councils together, putting the latter, which was in the year 416, under the year 402. which was the firſt *Milevitan* Council in *Numidia* in *Affrica*; and both held under *Innocent* Pope, and *Theodoſius* Emperor; which miſtake is taken notice of in *Regia Collectione*, with the grounds thereof. And in p. 541. you'l find theſe words beginning the Collection, **Sequuntur Concilia Africana ſub Innocentio habita**: which includes the Canon I cite in p. 559. aforeſaid.

1. *About P. Innocents Blaſphemy.*

That the 8*th*. is no miſ-repreſentation, in ſaying, That *P. Innocentius attributed divine Honour*

nour to the Popedom, will be easily conceived, inasmuch, as he singled out *Peter*, and attributed Divine Honour to him, put confidence in him, and desired help from him in conjunction with God himself; and whether he did it as to Pope *Peter*, or St. *Peter*, is not much material, the former is probable. And therefore doth *Fox* 2 *Vol. p.* 1020. *&c.* tell us in how many things the Popes blasphemously match themselves with God himself.

The 9*th.* out of *Vossius*, giving the Reasons from the Ancients, why they Baptized Men and Women naked, is a full and clear Translation, as fully made good from those particular instances given out of *Vossius* from *Cyril*, *Chrysostom*, *Cretensis*, *Anselm*, *Ambrose*, &c. his being a miserable trifle in his Appeal to the Reader, whether the Reasons given, were not *because their naked Bodies were to be Baptized, and not the Cloaths*, as I *ignorantly* (as he saith) *affirm*, whereas I give those Reasons, *why they Baptized their naked Bodies, and not the Cloaths*, viz. *That they might be, as in the state of Innocency*; and as in their *first Birth*, and as they expect to be in *Heaven*, or as *Christ* was *nailed to the Cross*. From the Ancients, which they expressly make out in *p.* 32. 9. *Quotation out of* Vossius.

Therefore it is left to the Reader to judge, where there is the least mis-representation, or false Translation in all these Particulars, and what cause to make an Appeal for the same.

V. The Fifth thing he complains against me for is, *For fathering upon Authors that which they indeed say not, at least in the places by me quoted*; whereof he gives 8 Instances. *Forgery.*

Answered. 1. *Quotation out of* Luther.

The first as to a Quotation out of *Luther de Sacrament. Tom. 3. fol.* 168. I transcribed it out of the same Author before mentioned, *the plain and well grounded Treatise*, p. 25. I have since examined that *Tome*, but cannot there find it; supposing, they either misquoted the *Tome*, or else quoted it out of another Edition, concluding, so large a Quotation was not fathered upon him, he speaking much that Language in other places.

2. *Out of* Bazil.

To the Second, as to the Quotation of *Bazil, contra Eunom.* who only say, That he saith, *lib.* 3. *That Baptism is the Seal of Faith.* But he will find the rest of the Sentence in that Book of *Bazil* they refer to, *viz. lib.* 3. *p* 84. *Baptism is the Seal of Faith; but Faith, the Confession of the Deity: for first he ought to believe, and after to be sealed with Baptism.* *

* *Nam credere prius oportet ac postea Baptismate designari.*

3. Magdeb.

To the Third, where he saith, *That the* Magdeburgs *do not say, it was the universal practise to Baptize the Adult under the* 4th. *Cent. as I affirm they do.* I say, That I have made it appear, they do by those Instances mentioned by them, from the sayings of the Doctors, and the Decrees of Councils, that Decreed only for Adult Baptism; and for which, I refer you to the former Chapter for further proof, that I did not mis-represent them therein. If I speak their sence, though vary in words, and contract what they say at large, I do them no injury. But so they do express it.

4. Arnobius.

To the 4*th*, That I quote *Arnobius*, a spurious Author, whilst I blame him for such, and which I say, I take out of the *Magd.* whereas the *Magdeburgs* have it not.

To

To which I say first, I do not know, that *Arnobius* upon the *Psalms*, is a spurious Author, should I have quoted him out of *Perkins*, who (Mr. *Wills* saith) tells us, it is spurious, as he did *Athanasius's* questions out of the *Magdeb.* which they said was so, I had been lyable to like Reproof. Neither 2*dly*. did I say, I took *Arnobius* out of the *Magdeburgs*; I said the *Magd.* did give some of those that followed, not all, he being mentioned upon the 146. *Psalm*, and not from any Book or Page in the *Magdeburgs*.

The Fifth, it is true, is a mistake as placed by the Printer, but not intended, as easily discern'd by the Reader, being put down as an additional Proof out of *Albertus*, having Inserted 3 before, the Printer putting *Aquinus* before the last of them, and so made that which I had put, *viz.* [And again] to belong to *Aquinus*, and not to *Albertus*. Which Venial mistake he makes equivolent with that grand one of *Bazil* for *Nazianzen*, which he so egregiously abused me for, and boasted what great acquaintance he had with Father *Bazil*, putting it down as a great remark 3 several times: This of mine being a proof for him, *viz.* to prove Infants Baptism; therefore it matters not much, whether from one or the other, they both speaking the same thing, that of his, wholly against me. 5. *Out of* Aquinus.

As to the 6*th*. the *Magd.* tell us, That Infants as well as the Adult, were Baptized; and instance onely in a Queen then Baptized, whom *Zonaras* calls *Rossorum Reginam*. And that's all (I confess) that *Zonaras* is concern'd in it. 6. *Out of the* Magd.

The 7*th*. is such another trifle. I say, *Vossius* saith, 7. *Out of* Vossius.

saith, (for he was a Collector from Authors; and those he quotes, we may in propriety of speech attribute to him) That *Nectarius* was made Bishop of *Constantinople* before he was Baptized, he says, he was but appointed so, the stress of the proof lying, That he was a Believer at age before he was Baptized, there being no such great difference, betwixt being made and appointed Bishop in the Case. And *Beza* there gives instances, not of obscure persons, but of persons, as he says, that had the eyes of all upon them Baptized at Age, *viz. Constantine*, *Nectarius*, and *Nazianzen.*

8. *One of Mr. B.* The 8*th.* is much like his fellows, in a Quotation from Mr. *Baxter*, proving against the Popish Doctrine, *ex opere operato*, to work Grace by the deed done, I brought him to say, *That Baptism of it self cannot give Grace or Regeneration, nor can work any such cause; for Water,* he saith, *is not a subject either capable of receiving or conveying Grace to the Soul.* But he saith, I abuse Mr. *Baxters* words, who saith, *That Baptism can be no such cause, whereby I do, as he saith, attribute Non-sence and Absurdity to him; and that there is neither Innocency nor Truth in so affixing it. If to work no such cause*, be such an error, it is a venial one, and I can say, not wilful; but certainly this Man would make notable work with me, if he had matter to work upon. But what just cause of Complaint or Appeal in all this, I profess seriously, I see not.

Misplacing Quotations VI. The 6*th* is, for picking out of *Authors here and there, and joyning them together, as if they were one intire Sentence, whereof he gives four Instances.*

To

To the 3 first, *viz.* Mr. *Baxter*, Dr. *Owen*, and Dr. *Taylor*, I say, I have put down nothing but their own, and what is congruous, one thing answering properly and naturally with another, which if it did not, we should, I presume, have heard of. *Answered.*

And for what relates to himself, which is the *4th.* I have done him no wrong, the Pages mentioned by me, *viz.* p. 36, 38, 101, 131, 132. I have particularly examined, and desire the Reader so to do; and let him judge betwixt us, whether he doth not in those Pages compared again and again say, *That as there is no Scripture expressly commanding, so neither is there any Scripture excluding Infants from Baptism, nor any Scripture that saith, there was no Infant Baptized,* each Page I would have put down, but that I would not burden the Reader; which you find expresst by me in my *Reply*, p. 63. and the several Pages particularly expressed, I refer to. And what good cause is given to complain of me in this, I see as little as the former.

VII. The *7th.* is, *for asserting notorious untruths, giving Instances of Eight.* *Notorious untruths.*

The first for affirming, *That Antiquity it self, so much boasted of, is altogether for Believers, and not for Infants Baptism*, an Assertion, as he saith, so *notoriously false*, that I have *confuted my self in owning the ancients asserted it.* 1. *Answered.* 1. *About Antiquity for Infant Baptism.*

This is already answered again and again, I hope to satisfaction, *viz. That primitive Antiquity is only for Believers, and not for Infants Baptism; and the Ancients in latter, not former*

former Centuries, onely for Infants Baptism?

2. *About Christning a Dead Child.*

The Second for saying, *That a Child that dyed unbaptized, was taken up and Christned, putting in the Margent a dead Child Christned; the Boy was not taken up and Baptized Dead; but after he came to life again, he was Baptized.*

In the first place, I conceive there is no untruth in my rendring the words, *Is puerum sine Baptismo mortuum resuscitarit ex mortuis, & tandem Baptizarit, That a Child that dyed unbaptized, was taken up and Christned*; being not exclusive of the sence Mr. *Wills* would have it bear. But 'tis the Margent that saith [*a dead Child Christned*] he mainly quarrels at, which indeed is wholly mine, and therefore my sence or explanation of my own words, is to be received, which admits of a Two fold, or double Interpretation, *viz.* either that Child that was Dead, now Christned, and so not to be blamed in Mr. *Wills* own sence: Or if I should intend the Child then dead when Christned, I know no reason, but I may have my liberty of Conjecture, as well as Mr. *Wills*: And the rather because, though *resuscitare* be generally understood, *to raise to life*, yet the phrase here, may, without any such palpable absurdity, be understood, a taking up from among the Dead, or out of the Grave; especially, because such an Interpretation so exactly agrees with their (then usual) practise to Baptize the Dead that dyed unbaptized; which certainly is more likely, and far more agreeable to truth, then that such a Miracle was wrought of raising to life. Besides, why may not the Dead be sometimes used for the Grave, as the Grave

is

is often (Metonymically) used for the Dead, and Death? as I could instance with great variety, had it been necessary. So that this latter (should I persist in it) is so far from being blameable, that it is indeed very probable; and therefore Reader, take it which way you will, no such notorious untruth as he talks of can hence be justly chargeable upon me.

The third notorious untruth he saith I assert, is from the *Magdeburgs*, Cent: 13. *p:* 419. *viz.* *That the Magd: do say, that as to the form of Baptism,* Gulielmus *added to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the Virgin* Mary, *viz.* *I baptize thee in the Name of the Omnipotent Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the Blessed Virgin* Mary; which saith he, is another notorious untruth; for the *Magdeburgs* say nothing of the Virgin *Mary*; but which of us speak truth, let the Reader judge: The words of the *Magdeburgs* are these in the *Cent:* and *p:* above-said, *viz:* *Male* Gulielmus *ad Formam Baptismi addidit* Mariam, *Baptizo te in Nomine Patris Omnipotentis, & Filii & Spiritus Sancti, & Beatæ Mariæ Virginis.* De Bapt: & ejus part. c. 2. Magd. Cent: 13. c: 419. *i: e.* Gulielmus *wickedly added* Mary *to the form of Baptism: I Baptize thee in the Name of the Omnipotent Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and the Blessed* Virgin Mary in his 2. *ch:* of Bapt. and its parts. Therefore if this be not daring temerity, I know not what is.

3 *About* Gulielmus *blasphemy.*

To the 4*th.* that the *Donatists* were against Infant-Baptism, *which*, he saith, *is as true, as that a Dead Child was Baptized, and that Pope* Innocent *was the first Inventor of Baptism, and Antiquity altogether for Believers, and not for Infants Baptism.*

4 *About the* Donatists.

What ground I had to affirm the *Donatists* were against Infants Baptism, I have given at large enough at least, if not to make it good, yet to free me from a Forger. Whether the Child taken up was living or dead, when Baptized (what I writ being capable of being interpreted either way) is left to better judgment; that I any where have said that Pope *Innocent* was the first Inventor of Infants Baptism, is I presume Mr. *Wills* his Invention not to be made good from my writings. I do indeed say, *p.* 111. And this was that *Innocent* who was the first great Patron and Imposer of this Invention. *viz.* In his Canon in the *Milevitan* Council, and so saith Dr. *Taylor*, *Grotius*, *Strabo*, *p.* 107. as well as my self, that Infants Baptism was never determined, nor enjoyned, nor imposed till then. And whether Antiquity, *viz.* of the first Centuries was not for Believers, and not for Infants Baptism; Let Mr. *Baxter* himself, with what hath been said, determine.

5 *About* Lanfrank. The 5*th.* about *Lanfranks* Testimony, one of my witnesses to prove *Berengarius* denyed Infants Baptism, is, I fully acknowledg my mistake, which (a Person of quality) a worthy Friend of mine several moneths since help'd me to discover, in examining that Story of *Berengarius* with me out of the *Magdeburgs*, and who is my witness of my intended resolution to rectifie the same, and which I concluded to have done, though not discovered by them. And the ground of that my mistake was truly this: I finding that in the Hypothesis of the erroneous Dogm's charged upon *Berengarius*; they gather up 5 or 6 Particulars, the first

first 4 respecting Transubstantiation, the 5th. and 6th. Infants Baptism, and Marriage, then superficially casting my Eye to the end of the Story, I found it said, *ad quintum & sextum opponit Doctrinam perpetuam & consentientem Ecclesiæ Dei*, *To the* 5th. and 6th. *he therein opposes the perpetual and agreeing Doctrine of the Church of God*; Quoting *Lanfrank* of the Sacraments, and his Book *de Scintill*: concluding it did respect those 5 or 6 Particulars before mentioned, but afterwards examining it with the aforesaid Friend, I found that those 5 or 6 Particulars did not include those first mentioned, but were 6 other Particulars discoursed about Transubstantiation, betwixt *Lanfrank* and him Yet this I must remark by the way, that though I mistook my self in this, yet the rest of my Testimonies to prove *Berengarius* did deny Infants Baptism hold good, as you'l find before in p. 92. 2d *Ep Guitmond* being one of them, who asserts that he did affirm Baptism did not profit little ones.

7. As to the Canon of *Illerdon* in *Spain*, I quote it out of the *Dutch* Book of Martyrs, for which they Cite their Authorities at large, *page* 189. 1 *Book*. And if they have mistaken it, let them be accountable for it, and me, no more than Mr. *Wills* desires to be, for quoting the *Magdeburgs* in their mistake about *Erasmus*. 7 Illerdon Canon.

6. Amongst my notorious untruths, he puts *my calling Circumcision a legal Ordinance, when as he saith, it was instituted* 400 *Years before the Law*. What then? so were Sacrifices 2000 Years before it; were they not therefore legal also, being enjoyned by God as well as 6 About Circumcision.

the other under the Law? and therefore 'tis said *of Circumcision, though of the Fathers, yet it was given by* Moses, *John* 7. 22. and which was so *legal*, that it bound to the keeping of the whole Law, *Gal*: 2. 3. and so *typical* and shadowy, that it was to be done away when Christ came, *Gal*: 2. 2. and of such *great stress* that there was no entring into the *Jewish* Church without it, & whoever eat the Passeover uncircumcised must be cut off: And that the Pædo-Baptists Arguments from Circumcision are begged, not proved: See my *Reasons* p: And how all my Arguments are begg'd or stollen, is begging still till proved, which will be best understood by his Answers, to which these are referred.

Sericius, *for* Hincmarus.

8: The mistake of the name *Sericius* for *Hincmarus* I own, but what Decrees were made by P: *Sericius*, so immediatly proceeding *Innocentius* for Infants Baptism as Mr: *Wills* supposeth, I find not: when he produceth them I'll blot out *Innocent*, and put *Sericius* the first Imposer of it.

Strange Doctrines.

VIII. *The last he charges is strange Doctrines.*

Answered.

1 *About the* Jewish *Church.*

The first for calling the National Church of the Jews, *made up of the Carnal Seed, a Carnal Church, who had Carnal Ordinances, which* he saith, *is Blasphemy to affirm*. But that Blasphemy the Holy Spirit will acquit me of, whilst he calls their Ordinances of their Church by that Name, and what *Salvo* Mr: *Wills* gives for their Ordinances, will serve for the Church also, *which is to be understood* (saith he) *Comparatively*; and so say I to the more Spiritual

Church

Church and Ordinances in the New Testament.

But that Baptism doth as much Initiate the carnal seed in the Gospel-Church, as circumcision under the Law, is I presume Mr. *Wills* strange Doctrine, God enjoyning the Infant-male or Carnal Seed to be circumcised; but so hath he not that under the Gospel they should be baptized: and touching which I refer you to Dr: *Owen* for better Information, as before.

2. *False Doctrine*, That *I do with Dr. Taylor say, Infants have neither Habitual nor actual Faith, nor are Disciples of Christ, and uncapable of Regeneration, so consequently of Salvation.* 2 *About Infants Faith and Regeneration.*

That they are uncapable of that Faith and Regeneration spoken by *James* 1. 18. 1 *Pet:* 1. 2, 3. *John* 1. 12, 13. And as Dr: *Owen* has defined Regeneration is all I say, *viz.* begotten by the *Preaching, Hearing*, and *Receiving of the Word*, renewed in knowledg changed and *Converted thereby*, is all that I affirm, *page* 213. That they are capable of Salvation by Christs purchase and the Application of his Blood and Spirit to them, who doubts it? I am sure I never affirmed the contrary.

3. The next false Doctrine is for *affirming nothing to be a Seal of the New Covenant, but the Holy Spirit, a strange Paradox!* But when Mr. *Wills*, or any body else proves the contrary, I shall be content to alter my judgment. 3 *Baptism no seal.*

4. *That Infants are neither capable to perform Duties, nor enjoy Privitedges, viz.* Church-privitedges as I have sufficiently explained my self *page* viz. *Baptism, Lords Supper, Hearing the Word, Church-watch, &c.* 4 *Infants capacity.*

5 About Baptism.

5. *For owning Baptism to be the gate of Sacraments, viz. in Jesu Jure viz.* The first entrance into the Church, where the Holy things in Christs order and way are duly administred, not in the Popish sense of Sacraments.

6 New Test. Church.

6. *That the New-Testament Church is by Christs appointment to be a separated people, consisting only of the Spiritual Seed of* Abraham; but he saith, *Hypocrites* and *wicked persons are in it.* But whether will he call that Christs, or the Devils appointment, who sows the Tares? of which Point Dr. *Owen* has well spoke, to whom I refer him as before.

7 About the Order of Baptism.

7. *That the Mystery should go before the Symbol.* Had Mr: *Ws.* represented the quotation truly, the very perusing it would clear me from this charge; but he (very unworthily) leaves out the Parenthesis which explicates the expression, and without which the words seem to impert a harsh Doctrine. The words are, *If the Mystery goes not before the Symbol, (which it does when the Symbols are consignations of Grace, as the Sacraments are) [this Parenthesis he leaves out] yet it alwayes accompanies it, but never follows in order of time.* I do not deny but a man may be Baptized if he professes Faith and repentance though not in truth, and in him the Mystery goes not before the Symbol; but coming afterwards really to believe and repent, it may follow in order of time. but then the Symbol to him when Baptized was no consignation of Grace. And now let the world judge whether Mr: *Ws.* dealt honestly in skiping over those words which were laid in on purpose to obvi-

re such a Cavil as he makes; it may be truly
aid of him, that if he cannot find a hole, he'll
make one.

8. *No visible Church-member before Conversi-* 8. *About*
on: I say none ought to be so; and so saith *Church-*
Dr: Owen. *Member-*
ship

9. *That I make a Believer and Dipping to be* 9. *About*
the right matter and form of Baptism, which I *the matter*
have proved against Mr: *Blinman*, and neither *and form*
by Mr: *Wills* nor him yet answered. *of Baptism.*

10. *That nothing now but Fruits meet for Re-* 10. *About*
pentance, can give right to the baptism of Repen- *receiving*
tance, and nothing short of the Spirits birth can or- *to Baptism.*
derly admit to Water-baptism, and Spiritual Ordi-
nances, a Doctrine apparently false, instancing in
John, *baptizing the* Jews *upon confession of sin*
and repentance, which was not Fruits, and the
3000 *Baptized*. Acts 2. And were they not
prick'd at heart, and received the word gladly,
and confest Christ to be the *Messiah*, whom they
had so lately before Crucified as a Blasphemer?
and were not those Fruits meet for Repentance
and amendment of life? *&c.*

THE CONCLUSION

THus I have given a *Candid* return to each Particular charged in this *Appeal*, publickly acknowledging what of Error or Mistake I am convinced of, and justifying my Innocency and Integrity in the rest; for as yet I see cause to own no more (not accounting a few immaterial over sights which Ingenious men would scorn to dwell upon) than the mis-naming two or three, *viz. Aquinas* for *Albertus*, *Sericius* for *Hincmarus*, not hitting the Pope *Deus dedit's* name, and not taking a Quotation out of

Wal-

Walden to so good advantage as I ought, that of *Austin* 3 and 4 Book being left out, *Lanfrank* being before owned to Mr. *Baxter*.

Concluding that as none of which can be supposed to be wilful, so neither can there be any obstinacy in the Case, having never heard of them before.

Therefore upon the whole, I joyn issue with Mr. *Wills*, freely submitting it to the Bar he has brought it; not doubting upon the due examination of his Complaint and my defence, that if they find me guilty of the Crimes he lays to my Charge; but they will, as he desires, discharge duty to me as becomes them, to bring me to the acknowledgment of my evil, or to disown me if obstinate, as a person unworthy to be countenanced amongst them.

But if on the contrary Mr: *Wills* his Appeal appears to be faulty, and the Particulars thereof not true, then that his said Appeal shall, as he desires, as unjust, reflect the blame of the charge upon himself, according to the righteous Law of the Lord.

Deut: 19. 16, 17, 18, 19. *If a false Witness rise up against any man, and testifie against him that which is wrong, then both the men before whom the Controversie is, shall stand before the Lord, and the Judges which shall be in those dayes. And the Judges shall make diligent inquisition; and behold if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsely against his Brother, then shall ye do unto him as he had thought to have done unto his Brother: So shalt thou put the evil away from amongst you: And those that remain shall hear, and fear, and shall henceforth commit no more any such evil among you.*

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

An Appeal to Mr Will's *Conscience.*

Sir,

I Having at your *Groundless* and injurious summons, given this full *Account* of my self, in my just *vindication*: And so far as I am *convinced* made (as you charitably suggest I would, *Pref. App.*) a *Candid* and publick acknowledgment of what of *error* or mistake is made out against me by your self or others, may therefore with more freedom *apply* to your Conscience herein, especially since I offer you *nothing*, but what I conceive carries demonstration with it, and back'd with *Scripture evidence*, for your better consideration and conviction.

Therefore in the first place, I desire you to consider, whether you are not notoriously guilty of *Back-biting*, by taking up reproaches from others, and *Tale-bearer* like, spreading and publishing the *same* to the defaming your Neighbour, without enquiring into the Truth *thereof* from himself; nay, refusing all due *information* and *satisfaction*, when friendly tendred to you. 1. *Reproach full Back-biting.*

For, have you not taken up these following things upon report and *Hear-say* from others, against one that is a meer stranger to you, & published the same to my disgrace, to promote thereby your Cause, *viz.*

First, That, as you have heard, *I own not so much Scholarship to compose such a Book, though my*

solitary life has given me opportunity enough to study, Pref. *Inf. Bapt.*

Secondly, That *I have only fixed my Name to the Book, that another chiefly has most Reason to own himself to be the Author of*, Pref. *Ibid.*

Thirdly, *That, as you have heard, I have* Ixion *like, faln in love with my own shaddow, puft up with the Excellency of my own performance*, Ibid.

Fourthly, That *I am a very tenacious Person, as you have heard*, Vind. P.

Fifthly, That *I am fain to call in the Wits of our Party, to help me to deal with you*, Pref. Vind.

Sixthly, That *I am of a Self-conceited-scornful Genius, unbecoming a Christian*, Infants Bapt. a g. 86.

Seventhly, Insinuating that *I am of such a (pugnatious or) fighting temper, that though my hands are tied behind me, yet will do it with Tongue and Pen*, Pref Inf. Bapt.

But, how agreeable such actings are with the following Scriptures, I leave you to judge.

Exod. 23. 1. *Thou shalt not receive a false Report: Put not thy hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous Witness.*

Levit. 19. 16. *Thou shalt not go up and down as a Tale-bearer among thy people.*

Psal. 15. 3. *He that back-biteth not with his tongue, nor doth evil to his Neighbour, nor taketh up a reproach against his Neighbour.*

Prov. 18. 8. *The words of a Tale-bearer are as wounds, &c.* 20. 10. *Where no Tale-bearer is, the strife ceaseth.*

Jer. 20. 10 *I have heard the defamation of many Report, say they, and we will report, &c.*

And to these add the Golden Rule, so highly

infringed thereby, Math. 7. 12. *Therefore all things whatsoever you would that Men should do unto you, do even so unto them, for this is the Law and the Prophets.* And would you be so dealt with by me and others, ask your own heart? Pray, read Mr. S. Rules to this Point, in his *Christian Directory*; some of which are given you in *p.* 158. 2. *Reply.* And amongst the rest, this is one:

If you know it not to be true, or there be no sufficient evidence to prove it, you are guilty of lying and slaundering interpretatively, though it should prove true, because it might have been a lye for ought you know.

Secondly, are you not evidently guilty of *Bitter Scoffing* and *Reviling* both Person and Book, and notoriously guilty of *Railing*.

1. As to *Scoffing* and jeering at my Person, Have you not deridingly called me the *Antisignanus*, the *Goliah*, one that is *Philantia nimis inflatus*; *viz. a proud conceited fellow*, one guilty of notorious *Plagiarism* or Thievery, and *shameful Oscitancy* or heedlesness, all in the *Preface of Inf. Bapt.* And scoffingly to tell me, *Bernardus non vidit omnia*; That *I am not such a seer as taken to be*, Inf. Bapt. p. 89. A *Hagio-Mastix*, *a sever Lasher*, Ibid. That I am a *Zoilippe*, and a *Momus*, a *meer Carper*, Vind. Scoffingly reflecting upon the Exploits or *Feats done in the daies of my Colonelship*, Ibid. p. 93. That you have *discovered my Mummery, and pluckt off the mask of my Vizard*, Pref. Vind. and much more of this kind. 2. *Scoffing and Railing.*

2. As to my *Book*, That it is a pompous Piece, very fallacious and contradictious, heapt up with forgeries and prevarications, swelled with *Sesquipe-*

quipedalia verba; *viz.* Words of a foot and half long or ridiculous stuff, *p.* 35. *Inf. Bapt.* The *non-such*, the Arguments therein *consisting only of Trite out-worn things that have been trampled upon, and confuted again and again*, Pref. Inf. Bapt.

And thirdly, Whether in a Railing reviling manner you have not called me, *One possest with a maleveleant Spirit, and filled with envy*, p. 11. Inf. Bapt. *An unworthy Caviler*, p. 13. Ibid. *Of so much disingenuity as to traduce the sayings of worthy Men*, p. Ibid. *Impudent, silly, ridiculous*, p. 16. 2. part. Ibid. *One that will not refuse the most sordid and shameful waies to promote my opinion*, p. 57. Ibid. *A daring Champion*; and again, *A daring Person indeed*, p. 72. Ibid. That *I discover the ebulition of a malicious Spirit*, p. 106. Ibid. Reflect the *Munster Venarian Spirit upon me* as one that *is under Satanical delusion*, p. 99. Ibid. One *that prevaricates to free my self from prevarication*, p. 2. Vind. That *I have added contumacy to my mistakes*, Pref. Vind. And *that never Writer did more prevaricate and shewed more falshood then I have done*, p. 34. Inf. Bapt.

But, how such language can stand before the following Scriptures? is submitted to your Conscience; *viz.*

Eph. 4. 31. *Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger and clamour, and evill speaking be put away from you with all malice, and be kind one to another, tender hearted.*

Prov. 15. 1. *A soft answer turneth away wrath, but grevious words stir up anger.*

Tit. 3. 2. *Speak evil of no Man*; Tim. 33. *not a brawler*; 1. Cor. 5 10. *If any that is called a Brother be a railer, with such a one do not eat.*

Matth.

Matth. 3. 22. *Whosoever is angry with his Brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the Judgment; and whosoever shall say unto his brother Racha, shall be in danger of the Council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of Hell fire.*

Thirdly, I desire you to consider whether you are not evidently guilty of *False accusation*, and notorious false *speaking*. 3. *False accusation, and speaking.*

First, in that general charge, *That never Writer did more prevaricate, or was guilty of more falshood then my self* (what! none of the *Popish* Legendaries?) whereas in both your Books you have not been able to make out any one that is significant; for after you have done your utmost to make good such a thing, what doth it amount more then to discover the mistaking of 2 or 3 Names, and not rendring that passage in *Walden*, so much to my advantage as it was, none of which can possibly be judged willful mistakes, nor be truly charged with *forgery* or *prevarication*, which must needs therefore return upon you, according to the Rule *Deut.* 19. 16, *&c.*

Secondly, in those many particular falshoods you have so positively charged upon me; *viz.* 1. That *I misrepresented Dr.* Taylor, *and dealt deceitfully in those Quotations out of his liberty of Prophecy*, *as* p. 35. Inf. Bapt. whereas the quite contrary is manifest, as p. 51, *&c.* of my *Reply*.

Secondly; That *I produced Durandus, a persecutor of Anabaptists, as a Witness for them*, p. 143. Inf. Bapt. when it is most manifest I do the quite contrary, p. 242, *Treaty*.

Thirdly, that I do bring *Jerom*, to say *such words upon the* 28. *Matth.*; *whereas you say, they*

are

are words of my own adding, and *none of Jeroms*; *and yet I tell you he saith it*, p. 166. Vind. whereas I have made good to you they are *verbatim Jeroms* own words upon that place.

Fourthly, That *I produce Gulielmus* from *the Magdeburgs*, for *saying the Virgin Mary should be added to the words of Baptism*; which you *say is a notorious untruth*, and *that the Magdeburgs say nothing of the Virgin Mary*, p. 185 Vind. And which I have expresly proved, and made good to a tittle as before.

Fifthly, you accuse me for abusing Dr. *Hamond* in that Quotation, on the 13. of *John* 10, *making him speak quite otherwise then he doth*; Satyrically deriding *me for the same*, p. 171. of your *Vind.* whereas I have made good to you that I did the Doctor no injury, but quoted his words truly and faithfully.

Sixthly, You accuse me, for saying, that the *Magdeburgs* say, that *the Apostles only Baptized the adult or aged*, Ch. 7. p. 2. *Inf. Bapt.* which you say is false; whereas I said no such thing, as p. 31. of *Reply* is demonstrated: and though I called for satisfaction again and again, yet you in your *Preface* to your Appeal justified, your self and severly reprove me for a *tenacious and unreasonable Person*, for not falling under your charge, what an *evidence it is of my obstinacy*; whereas my words were only these, *That the Magdeburgs tell us, that they find the adult or aged were only Baptized*; *viz.* in the Scripture Instances and Examples that they produce: And yet there you have the confidence to *tell me it is alone, nay makes more against me*; To which I say let it make for or against me, that is nothing to the falshood

you

you fathred upon me, I ſay, none of theſe words, neither doth it make at all againſt me; for they may find Scripture Inſtances only for the adult, and yet believe, as you grant, they did Baptize others then the adult, being two different things; but you tell me the word [*they find only ſuch*] implyed their certainty of the aſſertion, which they were ſo far from believing that they tell us, it appeared from the Apoſtles Writings, that they did not exclude Infants from Baptiſm; and at another time, *p.* 53. *Vind.* you tell me they ſay that *Origen* and *Cyprian* tell us, that Infants were Baptized in the Apoſtles daies; but what then do either of thoſe Inſtances produce any Scripture Example for the Baptizing of an Infant or any other, but the adult; which ſerves only to evince that had I ſaid, what you would have me ſay I had not ſo fairly repreſented them; *viz.* that they did only Baptize the adult, they believing with you, though upon as little ground, that Baptized the Infants alſo. But in as much as I ſaid they ſaid they found (*viz.* in thoſe Scripture Inſtances) Examples only for the one, and not for the other; I faithfully and truly repreſented them, and you did injuriouſly and untruly repreſent me, and for which inſtead of giving me ſatisfaction, you ſtill juſtify your ſelf; and for your better conviction read what I have further ſaid hereof before.

Seventhly, For your falſe and injurious charging me for producing *Munz'r* and *John of Leyden fro my Witneſſes, to prove againſt Infants Baptiſm*, ſcoffingly telling me, that *you will quietly permit me to enjoy the comfort and honour of ſuch Witneſſes*, p. 154. Vind. whereas I produce them not as any

of

of my Witnesses, but reflect upon their story, as I tell you *p.* 145. *Reply*: First, to *shew the unreasonableness of charging the Innocent with the crimes of such as are guilty.* And secondly, to *Examine that matter of fact, and how proved, upon which so much obliquity hath been cast upon the Anabaptists, and there way ever since*; and both of which I conceive was fairly and modestly done by me in that 4. Chapter.

Eightly, You scoffingly tell me, that *my invention will not serve me, to say any thing against one of the Waldenses Confessions for Infants Baptism*, viz. *that of Angrogne An.* 1535. viz. As *we promised when we were Baptized, being little ones*, p. 121. *which is a notorious falshood, for I expresly speak to it*, Treaty p. 310.: And which afterwards he is fain to confess, *p.* 122. *Vind.* saying, that Mr. *D.* tells us *p.* 313, that *these words being Baptized when little ones were foysted into the Article*, which I also there make good.

1. *Slandering Forreign Anabaptists.*

Secondly, You so falsly and slanderously accusing the *Anabaptists*, both forreign and domestick, that you might the better bring contempt upon them, and their cause, *viz.*

First, as to the Forreign *Anabaptists*, you charge those first Commotions, in *Swevia*, and *Munster*, to be *Anabaptistical*, p. 102, *&c* of you Inf. Bapt. the quite contrary upon due Examination is *manifested*, p. 146 of my Reply, and now unanswered by you.

Secondly, That the *Anabaptists, who were burnt, drowned and starved in Switzerland*, was for *perjury, disobedience, and sedition*; and not for *Anabaptistry*, *p.* 79. *Inf. Bapt.* the contrary whereto is fully manifested from the Decrees them-

themselves, which are word for word given you, and by what *Gastius* and *Hornberk* say in confirmation thereof; *viz.* for their judgement of *Rebaptization*, as appears p. 152 of Rep. and Treat. p. 260. where the Edicts themselves are expressed.

Thirdly, For charging those in *Germany to be so universally wicked and immoral*, p. 200. whereas the contrary was made good to you from *Bezas* words, *viz.* That *many of the Anabaptists are good Men, Servants of God, Martyrs of Christ*; and our most dear *Bn.* in his Ep. to the *Gallo-Belgick* Churches at *Embden*, as Repl. p. 151. Besides the account of many 1000 of them that as Faithful Martyrs sealed the truth with their Blood, as Treat. 256, *&c.* appears to you.

Fourthly, That *their principles were heretical and blasphemous*, p. 94. *&c.* whereas from their confessions of Faith themselves, it is manifest they held the same with the *Waldenses*, as appears p. 154. Rep.

Fifthly, That the *Ministers*, those *Holland Anabaptists were for resistance* of *in affinity with the Munster Satanical deluson*, which put *them upon such exorbitances*, p. 99. whereas the quite contrary is said of them, and known to be their constant practise, refusing to bear Armes, or to carry so much as a Gun in their Ships, as p. 147, *&c.*

Secondly, as to our *English Anabaptists*, have you not in like manner powred reproach upon them, by your notorious false accusations, *viz.*

2. *Slandring* English *Anabaptists.*

First, You stick not to say, *that those who are inclinable to their way, are now grown so politick as not to profess their Faith till warm weather*; scof-

fingly telling us, *that many last Summer were dipped in our parts, and in all likelyhood we may hear of many more this Summer*, Preface to Infants Bapt.

The falshood and slander whereof is refuted by known experience.

Secondly, neither are you ashamed to lay *blasphemy* and *immorality to the charge of diverse Anabaptists in our own Nation*, p. 95. implying, as I told you in my Reply p. 151. that the rest bore with them, otherwise, why is it mentioned, as I told you, challinging you to produce one Man of those divers Persons that is truly to be charged, with your due proofs for the same; or else to be esteemed as truly you ought to be a false accuser of the Brethren, which notwithstanding you have neither done in your last *Book*, nor taken shame for your sin and folly therein.

Thirdly, and that above all you have not been affrayed to charge the Principle of *Anabaptistry* it self, *viz. To be of a dangerous nature*: Your words are these, That *you may safely affirm that is a Doctrine to be suspected false, which is usually attended with gross miscarriages in the Professors of it*; for that *bespeaks it ominous and like a spiritual Judgement of God upon it*: And, *I heartily wish*, say you, *there were no ground to say that of such a nature is the Doctrine of Baptizing grown Persons, in opposition to that of the Infts. Seed of Believers, for not to insist upon*. The *horrid errors and wicked lives of those in Germany, and blasphemies. and immoralities of diverse in our own Nation*. [that being taken for granted, it seems to be undoubted proof in confirmation hereof] And *that as some Men hold it* (*viz.* that

Baptism

Baptism is a boundary of Communion) *is of such a disquieting tendancy, that it is not fit for any age or state of the Church.* And as *soon as Men become Baptists* (as they call themselves, affecting as you say that name) *they fall off from Godly Ministers*, &c as *an effect* (*as you reflect*) *of ignorance and pride*, and to the *scandal and shame of Christian Religion*, p. 94, 95. And in your Preface you tell us with Mr. *Sydnham*, that *the opinion of* Antipædobaptism *hath been alwaies ominous, and of a wonderful strange influence, to distroy Unity and Peace amongst Christians, accompanied also with the most retinue of errors, since the first Embrio of it was brought forth, whether by a secret judgement of God, or from the natural and setret connexion with other Principles of darkness, will not with Mr.* Sydnnham *determine* (oh wonderful Charity!) *only God hath shewed some black Characters of it in exery Nation, where it hath prevailed.*

And, *Men of this opinion so inflexible, that never any of them was heard to change his opinion, unless to some worse error*, (and how can that well be, if this be true that you have affirmed?) But, what can be spoken more venanous, more false, and repugnant to truth and common honesty, and more savouring of a malicious mind, is left to your Conscience to determine; Entreating you seriously to consider how such dealing can stand before these following *Scriptures.*

Exod. 20. 16. *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy Neighbour.*

23. 1. *Thou shalt not receive a false report, put not thy hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness.*

It being one of the things the Lord hates and abominates, as viz. Prov. 6. 19. *A false witness that speaketh lies, and him that soweth discord amongst Brethren.*

Prov. 15. 18. *He that beareth false witness against his Neighbour is a maul, and a sword, and and a sharp Arrow.*

Prov. 19. 9. *A false witness shall not be unpunished, and he that speaketh lies shall not escape.*
Deut. 19, 16, 18. *If a false witness rise up against any man to testify against him that which is wrong--- the Judges shall make diligent search; and behold, if the witness be a false witness, and hath testified falsly against his Brother, then shall you do unto him as he had thought to have done unto his Brother: so shalt thou put the evil away from among you*: Which I shall conclude with that serious word, Dr. *Stubs* speaks to Mr. *B.* upon like occasion, and which I desire you to lay to heart: "If he be a slanderer, who wrongs his Neighbours credit, either by unjust raising, or upholding an evil report against him, surely you have cause to lay your hand upon your heart, and to toke shame to you self. And if this be the mark of those that shall dwell in the Lords Tabernacle, that they are such that neither raise nor take up a reproach against their Neighbour, *Psal.* 15, 3. *What will become of You* [Mr. Wills] *and where, & with whom must you dwell to Eternity, if God do not humble you, for your slanderous and lying Tongue and Pen?*

4. *Prevarication.* Fourthly, are you not truly found guilty of *Prevarication*, in many particulars, the thing you so notoriously and falsly charge upon me, which is according to your own definition, p. 7. Vind.

7. Vind. *To conceal what ought to have been declared on purpose to deceive*: And of which I shall give you a few of many Instances that might be produced, *viz.*

First, Is it not manifest, as I have undeniably proved (and in your own word by Mathematical Demonstration) that you *left out so many of the most considerable passages of the Waldensian Confessions*, as p. 45. 2 part Inf. Bapt. and for which you have given no satisfaction, though you was so earnestly called upon by my self, as well as Mr. *Tombes* for the same.

Secondly, by leaving out *part of that Confession you took out of Bishop Usher*, p. 119. Vind. which *Hoveden* calls the *Waldenses*, I the *Popish Inquisitors*, you only taking part of it, which declares for *Infant Baptism to save them*; and yet you can tell us at another time, that the *Waldenses* affirmed that it *profited them not for salvation*. That the better to hide the cheat can now tell us in their excuse, that *this was a dark time 500 years since; but in the mean time conceal that other part*, which bespeaks it wholly *Popish*; *viz.* for the *Mass*, *Popish-Priesthood*, *Real presence*, *Penance*, *&c.* which *Usher* is so faithful to give, and which I have at large discovered to Mr. *B.* your Partner, in that evil; p. 84. 2 Reply.

Thirdly, by repeating every syllable of that *Quotation* p. 169. Vind. called *Calvins*; yet leaving out *the last Clause Estius* Annot. on *Gen.* 17. 7. which you know is there, as Treaty p. 176. Vind. And yet so often upraid me for not calling it *Estius*'s, not only in your first Book, but 3 times, and very unmercifully too in your last.

Fourthly, by *Concealing* so much of the *Translation of that out of Calvins Institutes*, that you might the better *deceive* your *English Reader*, and make him believe it was the Objection of *Fools*, and not owned by *Calvin himself*, which his next words, as I have demonstrated and you very well knew, doth.

Fifthly, by that injurious dealing with me in that Quotation of mine from *Spanhæmius*, and *Osiander* p. 326. of my Treat you only take notice of what *Spanhæmius* speaks to part leave out what I say *Osrander saith* to the rest, and reprove me *for my mistake*, p. 104. *Inf. Bapt.* and though I called upon you in my *Replyi*, *for satisfaction*, *Pref. and p.* 148. yet you return ne not one syllable in your last.

Sixthly, by that injurious leaving out what you in your first p. quot from *my* 20. *p.* of Reply, which speaks it to be quite an other thing then you make it to be, and thereupon charge me with *prevarication*, if not *madness and contradiction*, which was an ill beginning that you should so stumble at the threthold; as though I quoted *Austin*, and those Antients downwards to prove that the practise of *Inf. Bapt.* was not in those *Centuries*, when I say the quite *contrary*, and tell you expressly, that I quote them only for their sayings, which *speak so fully for Adult Baptism only*, contrary to their express practise. And then by affirming again and again that I contradict my self in owning the Antients were for Infants Baptism, and denying there was *Antiquity for it*: whereas the foregoing words in my 19. *p.* enumerates them from *Austin*, and not the Antients of the former Centuries, whom I claim for *Beleivers Bapt.* only.

Se-

Seventhly, by the like injurious *dealing with me*, p. 57. Vind. taking part of a ſaying of mine in *Treat. p.* 101. and leaving out the next following words in *p.* 102. rendring me thereby ridiculous, and then call me at your pleaſure, when I am ſo wholly innocent in the matter; *viz. I juſtify my ſelf in my Reply p.* 36. from *that falſhood you charge upon me, ſuppoſing me to ſay, that dipping was changed into Sprinkling the* 3. *Centurie*, when I only ſay that *the Magdeb. do tell us, that many corruptions about Bapt. was creeping in amongſt the reſt I mentioned* (as I ſaw cauſe) that of *Cyprians* Letter to *Magnus* about *Sprinkling, for dipping.* But withall do ſay, they tell us they do not find any one perſon was then *Baptized* with any of their corrupt Ceremonies, having indeed, as they ſoy, no *authentik proof of the Baptizing of any one perſon*; whereby I ſay it may be *conjectured their corruptions were then more in the notion then practiſe, which afterwards came all of them to be in uſe.*

You are pleaſed to repeat my former words about their *beginning to alter the forme from dippin to ſpinkling*, and leave out all my latter words both what I ſo fully ſpeak in the Treat. and my Rep. alſo. And then as p. 51. *I ſuppoſe*, Reader, *thou haſt ſeldom met with the like ridiculous contradiction in any Author —— So that he is the Man that hath cauſe to be aſhamed, and is found very unfaithfull in ſpeaking forwards and backwards at his pleaſure; yea, that which is manifeſtly falſe, and then denying in the ſame breath, ſo adding one falſehood to another.*

And therefore whilſt you judge me ſo worthy of reproof for *prevarication* (though not at all proved

proved *by you*) and you your ſelf ſo guilty thereof, as ſo fully evidenced, doth not this following Scripture concern you?

Rom. 2. 1. 23. *Therefore thou art inexcuſable, O Man, whoſoever thou art that judgeſt, for wherein thou judgeſt thou condemneſt thy ſelf, for thou that judgeſt doth the ſame thing.*

But, *we are ſure the judgement of God is according to truth againſt them, which commit ſuch things. And thinkeſt thou this, O Man, that judges them, which do ſuch things and doth the ſame, that thou ſhalt eſcape the judgement of God.*

Verſe 21. *Thou therefore which teacheſt another, teacheſt thou not thy ſelf, thou that preacheſt, a Man ſhould not ſteal, doſt thou ſteal.* So thou that teacheſt a Man ſhould not prevaricate, why art thou guilty of ſo much prevarication, and ſo ſelf judged and condemned therein?

5. Forgery. And fifthly, is it not evident that you are hanouſly guilty of *Forgery*; *viz.* pretending Authors ſay *ſo* and *ſo*, when they ſay no ſuch thing, or the quite *contrary*.

Of which I ſhall give you few Inſtances.

Firſt, do not you affirm *p.* 45. *Vind. that Walden ſheweth from Wickliffs works that he was for Infants Baptiſm*; whereas he abundantly ſaith the quite contrary, and your own Pen is conſtrained at another time to acknowledge, as *p.* 125, 172. *Vind.*

Secondly, do not you poſitively *affirme*, *that Auſtin ſaith in his third Book* De Anima, *c.* 13. that *Vincentius Victor his opinion was that Infants that dyed Baptized went immediately to Heaven*; whereas there is no ſuch thing ſaid, either in that or any other Chapter that I can find.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, do not you say that *Rainerius in the Catalogue of the Waldensian errours brings not one word of their denying Inf. Bapt.* as p. 67. *Inf. Bapt.* whereas he expresly saith in that Catalogue, that *they affirmed Inf. Bapt.* was nothing worth, and that *Gossips that undertook for them knew not what they did*; *for which see Rep.* p. 125. 131.

Fourthly, do now affirme that Dr. *Taylor in his Book called Consideration of the Practise of the Church*, and Dr. *Hamond in his Letter of Resolutions*, *had given answer to those Arguments produced by me*, *out of his Liberty of Prophecy against Infants Baptism*, as p. 36, 37, 98. of your *Infants Baptism*; whereas in p. 53, *&c.* of my *Reply*, it is fully made out from both their words, that they do confirme those Arguments to be good that are therein brought against the principle Arguments, the *Pædobaptists* bring for that their practise.

Fifthly, do not *you produce* Basil, *to be an Eminent witness for Infants Baptism in the fourth Century*, *as p.* 136. Whereas there is never *such a word to be found in any of Basils writings that doth yet appear.*

Sixthly, you do positively affirme from the acquaintance you had with Father *Basil* that he in his third Book Contr. *Unomiam* in the very next lines after those words *I had repeated of that quotation*, *declared himself to be for Infants Baptism.* And for *my omitting the same*, *call upon the Reader to have a care henceforwards how they trust my quotations for the palpable abuse done to that Father*, *and for a fallacy and falshood upon the Reader*, p. 13. Inf. Bapt. And again in his Preface, charging me *for curtailing and leaving out*

part of that Sentence of Basils. About which I got a Friend first to write to you, to know where to find it: to which you replyed, that * for which manifest injury done to *Basil* and *me*, also in that your severe *Reflection*, I called for satisfaction, as p. 48. *Reply.* But all that I can get yet from you is this, that you mistook only a name *Basil* for *Naziazen*, p. 61. *Vind.* Equilizing my mistake of *Albertus* for *Aquinus with it*, p. 183.

**You charged me not for misquoting, but for partially quoting and misapplying it, but could not direct to the page.*

Which I cannot take for due pay: First, because it was not a bare slip in haste, but a thing justified by you in coold blood when I gave you time to *deliberate upon it*, by sending so civily *to you that* you might have an opportunity to rectify it, or clear your self.

Secondly. by your extenuating it, as though it was just *like my mistaking*, *Albertus* for *Aquiquinus*, which I can by no means admit for that was a *quotation* for you to prove for Infant Bapt. which cannot demonstrate any *wilfulness in me*, nor that I could have any end in the mistake, nor was it improved to *your prejudice*; whereas that of yours was a great *proof against me*, highly boasted of by you to discover your reading and acquaintance with that *Father*, and improved much to my disgrace, and often and very severly inculcated upon me. Therefore I do expect from you more fuller satisfaction therein, and your due humiliation *for such a notorious miscarriage.*
As well for your vainglorious boast as your trampling *so upon me.*

Seventhly, in like manner was your dealing about what you own to be your mistake, only of a Century *respecting Peter Bruis p.* 53. *Inf. Bapt.* out of *Osiander*, which was not only so, but the

the sever lashes you gave *me about it*; *viz.* That *you see by this that when Men are ingaged in a Cause, and wedded to an opinion, they will not refuse the most sordid and shamefull waies to promote it fall in with slanderous Papists, and take up what they say to defend their opinions, witness my Antagonist.* And at this rate you go on chastising of me, and all upon your own gross *forgery and mistake:* For which Sir, I expect your *repentance*, you did not mistake a Century only, but *Christianity*, *Civility*, and *Common Honesty* also; and you did not only *abuse me*, but *Osiander Cluniacensis*, *Peter Bruis*, and yet have you the confidence to tell me *p.* 131. that you could retort upon me, that I belyed *Calvin*. I belyed *the Truth*, and by that *forgery*, I would *cover*, and *hide*, and *abuse* the World with a *cheat*, and *much more*, *my own Conscience*, by that piece of *folly and falshood.*

Whereas is now manifestly appears that I did put *Estius* his name to the Quotation; and therefore there could be neither cheat, abusing of the World, forgery, nor falshood in the matter; which doth but heighten your crime, and makes more work *for Repentance*, which I also duly call far from you.

And therefore to further, the same desire you to read and consider the following Scriptures.

Lev. 19. 11. *Ye shall not lie one to another.*

Prov. 14. 5 *A faithful witness will not lie, but a false witness uttereth lies.*

Eph. 4. 25. *Wherefore puting away lying speak every Man truth with his Neighbour.*

Col. 39. *Lye not one to another.*

Psalm. 119 69. *The proud hath forged lyes.*

Jer. 9, 3. *They bend their tongues like bows for lies, but are not valiant for the truth.* With

With the Scriptures before mentioned, Rom. 2. 1, 2, 3, 21. *Because you have proclamed me such a forger, and judged me for the same, but has yet made no proof thereof.*

6. *Mistranslation.* And sixthly, are not you guilty of *Mistranslation*, and *Misrendring Authors*. For *Instance*;

First, That notorious passage about the *Minists*, which you translate quite contrary to *Truth*; *viz.* that *they were for Resistance in the Munster way, and for distroying the wicked by force of Armes, in order to the setting up the Kingdom of Christ*, p. 99. of Inf. Bapt. when the quite contrary is there said and the constant knowledge of their principles and practise evinceth.

Secondly, for Misrendring that passage out of *Calvins Institutes*, before accounted for in the appeal to be the objection of fools, when *Calvin* owns the same to be his Judgement.

Thirdly, for Misrendring a passage out of *Austins* 3. *B. de Anima*, fathring that upon *Vincentius Victor*, that is not there said of him.

Fourthly, for translating βρεφὸς, to signify only an Infant without understanding, p. 11. *Inf. Bapt.* when the contrary is true, as appears 2 *Tim.* 3, 4. *Thou hast known the holy Scriptures a Child, there is the same word.*

7. *Hypocrisy.* Lastly, whether your solemn Appeal to the *Searcher of hearts*, that you have no maliguity to my Person, having ground to hope I am a Godly Man; and in your Preface to *Vind. that you love me as a Brother though erring, and had much rather convince then shame me, can be well reconciled to sincerity, and not rather speaking lyes in hypocrisy:* when it is considered, First, how you have declined all fair Brotherly waies

of

of receiving ſatisfaction, chooſing rather in this publick manner to *reproach* and *ſlander me* upon hear-ſay: 2. to jeer and *Scoff at me*: 3. to *Raile* upon and *Revile me* in that unchriſtian manner you have done, ſpeaking ſo much *evil of me falſly*: 4. proclaiming me with your *Aſſociates* in the *Garet* and in the *Catalogues* (where you know I cannot follow you for my vindication) 5. And at laſt ſo groundleſly, diſorderly, not to ſay maliciouſly to Appeal to the *Baptiſts* againſt me, as a perſon that has added contumacy, to my miſtakes and evils.

All which is recommended to your Conſcience in the ſight of God; (and all that are conſcientiouſly concerned with you) leaving it to your choice, which of your promiſſes you will keep, whether that in the concluſion of your firſt *Pref. Vind. To anſwer me by ſilence, becauſe you will not gape againſt an Oven*: Or that in the end of your laſt *Preface*; viz. *That if I can make it appear that I have wronged you herein, as you can truly ſay you did it not willingly; So you faithfully promiſe to make me publick ſatisfaction by acknowledging your miſtakes.*

FINIS.

ERRATA.

THE Reader is desired to correct these Errors of the Press in the Rejoynder, viz. Pag. 8, Line last, read *enjoyned*. P. 18, l. 4. dele the comma after *Doctor*. P. 36, l. 3. for 22, r. 25.

The Reader is also intreated to correct this following in the Treatise, being all the mistakes of moment, that I have yet met with from any hand.

1. Of my own or Friends discovery, p. 55, 56. for *Eastern*, r. *Westen*. p. 139, for *Erasmus*, r. *Beza*. p. 224, blot out *Lanfranks* testimony about *Berengarius*.

2. Of Mr. *Baxters*, p. 223. for 3 *and* 4 *Book against the Donatists*, r. *fourth Book*, for *Cochleus*, r. *Walden*.

3. Of *Mr. Wills*, p. 75, *Albertus* for *Aquinas*. p. 116, blot out *Deodans*. p. 287, blot out *Pelagius*, and *Vincentius Victor*. p. 116, *Hincmarus* for *Sericius*.

If any of my *Authors*, whom I have truly quoted, have mistaken themselves, let them, not me, be accountable for such Errors.

An Advertissement.

To prevent any further Cavil, I desire to intimate as followeth. 1, As to that passage of *Nazianzen*, I own it is not translated *verbatim*, but the sense and consequential meaning only given: For if the Baptized of old were wont to confess their sins, the Baptized, being indefinite and equivalent with an universal expression, is asmuch as if all that were Baptized did so; and if all did confess their sins, then none but such were Baptized in the first times, as many Authors so positively assirm. And if it was not so, it would signify little, the Adult as is owned, were to confess their sins at all times As to what is said, that *Nazianzen* was for *Infant Baptism*. (which from the grounds before mentioned is much doubted) yet if it be taken for granted, he might nevertheless affirm, as many others *Pædobaptists* do, That only the Adult in the primitives times were Baptized.

As to what is said about the Milevitan Council, *those* 3 *particulars mentioned p.* 34 *from the Preamble, Synodical, and Decretal Letters expressing the Heresy of those they condemn, is also so censured in the Councel. as I find it exprest in the Addition to the Canon mentioned in the* Regia Collect. *though not exprest by the* Magd.

As to that of Athanasius, *Mr.* Wills *quarrels at me for mistranslating, it is a mistake of his own; for what I say respects the Age, so does what* Athanasius *says to*; viz. *Hoc vero seculo eundem* (viz. *Baptismum*) *durasse ex Athanasio quæst.* 124. *constat. i e. It appears from* Athanasius 124. *questions, that it* (viz *Infant Baptism*) *was in this Age; which questions of* Athanasius *are acknowledged to be spurious.*

THE Baptists Answer, TO Mr. OBED. WILLS, HIS APPEAL Against Mr. H. DANVERS.

REGENTS PARK COLL. NOON LIBRARY

LONDON,
Printed for *Francis Smith*, at the *Elephant* and *Castle* in *Cornhill*, near the *Royal-Exchange*, 1675.

An *Advertiſment* from the Bookſeller.

THe *Impartial Reader deſiring Information into the Principle of Baptizing Believers, may be furniſh'd with the following Treatiſes, bound together, or ſeverally.*

A Treatiſe of Baptiſm: wherein that of Believers, and that of Infants is Examined by the Scriptures, with the Hiſtory of both out of Antiquity.

A Reply *to Mr.* Wills, *in Defence of the ſaid Treatiſe.*

A Second Reply *to Mr.* Baxter, *in Defence of the ſame.*

A Rejoynder *to Mr.* Wills *his* Vindiciæ; *with an Anſwer to his* Appeal; *all by Mr.* Henry Danvers.

A Treatiſe concerning the Covenant and Baptiſm; wherein is ſhewed, that Believers only are the Spiritual Seed of Abraham; *with a* Reply *to Mr.* Whiſtons Anſwer *to Mr.* Danvers, *by Mr.* Edward Hutchinſon: *With a* Letter [*of* Reproof] *to Mr.* Obed. Wills *by* T. B.

The Baptists Answer to Mr. Obed. Wills, *his* Appeal *against Mr.* H. Danvers.

SIR,

WE have seriously considered your *Appeal* against Mr. *Danvers*, and have also heard, and carefully weighed the *Defence* he makes thereto; and in order to give an Impartial *Judgment*, as you call us to, have desired some of our *Number* diligently to examine the *Authors* cited by you both; and though it appears to us, that Mr. *Danvers*, has earnestly endeavoured an *accomodation*, in a more pri-

vate and friendly manner, betwixt you and him, ſo to rectifie miſtakes on any hand, which (had it been accepted of) might have ſaved this *trouble*; and that the Method you have uſed in this *Appeal* be unuſual, and unlike the *Pattern* you ſeem to take; an *Appeal* in theſe Caſes being then only *proper*, when the Party appealed againſt, appears to be ſo *contumacious*, and *ſtubborn*, as to *reject*, and ſtand out againſt juſt *conviction* and *admonition*; which we find not to be juſtly chargeable upon Mr. *Danvers*, and whether it be not rather your own overſight, we hope you will in time be ſenſible of; yet we ſay, we ſhall not inſiſt upon that *Conſideration*; and to give you, and the World that ſatisfaction *expected* from us, ſome

ſome of us whoſe names are ſubſcribed, have examined the Particulars you charge him with, and find ſome miſtakes and eſcapes on Mr. *Danvers* ſide, which he ingeniouſly acknowledges; and we hope may be to your full *ſatisfa-on* as it cannot (in juſtice) but be to ours, ſince (as you ſeem tohint) *a publick owning, is what you expect.*

Some of the Particulars in your *Appeal*, we find to be ſo *trivial*, and *inſignificant*, that they deſerve not to be *mentioned*, and deem his Anſwers returned to them *reſpectively*, ſufficient to ſatisfie the Reader.

Others of your Charges he *traverſes*, and joyns iſſue with you at the *Bar* you have brought it to, and the moſt material of theſe we now remark to you; ſo that what

he *acknowledges*, and what's *inconsiderable*, and what's here further *examined*, comprehends your whole *Appeal*.

And we must observe to you, that you lie *obnoxious* to the Return you made to Mr. *Danvers*, when he charged you with leaving out part of the *Sentence* of *Nazianzen*, *viz. Si aliquid periculi immineat*, calling it, *p.* 7. of your *Vind. A frivolous Charge*; excusing your self after such a manner as you will not be satisfied with from others; therefore if we say many of your Charges are *frivolous*, your Reason in your own behalf will *Justifie* us, you being Judge.

I. And therefore 1. we desire you to consider, whether the *stopping your Translation out of* Calvin, *where you did*, p. 162. *Appeal*, be not

not unfair, and a misleading an *English* Reader.

II. You charge Coll' *Danvers Appeal, p.* 166. to adde the words, [*for it cannot be, that the Body should receive the Sacrament of Baptism till the Soul hath before received the truth of Faith*] and say they are not *Jeroms* Words, but of Mr. *Danvers* Adding: But upon Examination of that place [*Mat.* 28. *Tom.* 9 *Edit. Paris. An.* 1546.] we find them to be *Jeroms* Words Verbatim, as Mr. *Danvers* Cites them. And we observe in your *Quotation* of Mr. *Danvers*, in that place you *add*, [*Magd. Cent.* 4. *c.* 6. 418.] as if Mr. *Danvers* had particularly *Quoted the Magd.* there, which indeed he doth not; but only *Jerom* upon *Mathew*, which Double *Injury* we conceive

deserves your Double *Consideration*, in order to a Candid *acknowledgment*.

III. You charge him, *p.* 169. With abusing *Calvin*, fathering *Estius's* Words upon him, though he hath owned it a mistake in his *Reply*, But we observe also, That he Quotes *Estius Annot. Gen.* 17. 7. at the end, which you leave out, though you took all his words to that, and yet reprove him so often for the same, which seems neither *ingenious* nor *fair*.

IV. You charge him with abusing Dr. *Hamond*, *p.* 107. in affirming, *That* βαπτισμος *signifies an Immersion, or Washing the whole Body, answering the Hebrew* טבילה whereas you say the Dr. tells us, λόυσις *signifies the washing the whole Body, and answers to* טבילה &c. We have *examined*

mined the Doctor's Book, Printed for *R. Royston*, *Anno* 1653. and find Mr. *Danvers* quoted his words truly, and the mistake to be yours, which we hope will convince you of the untrue and unjust reproach you subjoyn, *That he understands not English Authors*, &c.

V. You charge Mr. *Danvers* for affirming from *Walden*, That the *Wicklevians*, in agreement to the Doctrine of *Pelagius* and others, denyed Infant Baptism, he acknowledges it to be his mistake to alledge, That it was agreeable to *Pelagius* and others, (said to be for Infant Baptism) but if *Walden* be to be believed, it appears, That the *Wickliffists* judged Ecclesiastical Baptism unprofitable to little ones, in these words [*nostri Wicliviſtæ Baptiſmum Eccleſiaſticum*

cum inutile judicant parvulis *contra omnes prædictos*] againſt all the aforeſaid, *viz. Pelagius, Vincentius Victor, and thoſe that Baptized Children, as born of Believing Parents.* And we muſt remark to you, that in your Quotation, *p.* 172. *Appeal*, you leave out [*parvulis*] the principal word there, and with what deſign or end we leave you to conſider.

VI. You charge him, *p.* 179, 180. for adding the Words [*it is our Will, That all that affirm, That Young Children receive Everlaſting Life, albeit they be not by the Sacrament of Grace or Baptiſm renewed*] to the *Milevitan Decree.* We have examined that 4*th. Tom. in Collect. Reg.* and find the *Canon* quoted by Mr. *Danvers* in *p.* 559. of it, taken out of a *very antient Copy*, immediately

ately following the Words you Cite, thus, *Item placuit, ut ſiquis dicit ideo dixiſſe dominum*; In domo patris mei manſiones multæ ſunt, *ut intelligatur, quia in regno Cœlorum erit aliquis medius, aut ullus alicubi locus, ubi beate vivant parvuli, qui ſine Baptiſmo ex hac vita migrarunt ſine quo in regno Cœlorum quod eſt vita æterna intrare non poſſunt, Anathema ſit*, *An. Chriſti* 424. Now for you to affirm, that the ſaid Clauſe was of Mr. *Danvers*'s own adding; whereas, as he ſays, *Here is an expreſs* Anathema *againſt thoſe that affirmed Children might be ſaved without Baptiſm, is* an Inſtance (to give the moſt favourable conjecture of it) that you have made but a lame ſearch: So that it is very juſt for us to acquit *Mr. Danvers* of this Charge. We preſume you know, that the *Magdeburgs*

burgs give an account when they ſpeak of that *Milevitan Synod*, of ſome that affirm'd Infants Salvation without Baptiſm, as by the Inſtances *Mr. Danvers* gives from them, undeniably appears; And in oppoſition to them was that *Anathema* enacted, and every Circumſtance concurs to evidence it as genuine as the other *Canons*: And therefore upon a review of the place we queſtion not but you will be ſatisfied here is no *forgery* or *prevarication* in *Mr. Danvers* in this Particular.

VII. Under the Head of his *fathering upon Authors that which they ſay not*, you charge him with abuſing *Baſil. Appeal p.* 181. in fathering thoſe Words upon him, [*muſt the faithful be ſealed with Baptiſm? Faith muſt precede, and*

go

go before] whereas you ſay, *there is no ſuch Speech in what the* Magd. *repeat of* Baſil, contra Eunom. which we conceive to be a very weak ground for your Charge. For muſt it follow, that the Words are not *Baſils*, becauſe you find it not in the *Magdeburgs*? we have ſearch'd *Baſil*, and find his VVords to be *lib.* 3. *p.* 84. *contra Eunom.* to the ſence he is Cited by Mr. *Danvers*, viz. πιστεῦσαι γαρ δὲ πρότερον εἶτα τῷ βαπτίσματι ἐπισφραγίζεσθαι, i. e. *It is neceſſary firſt to believe, and afterwards to be ſigned with Baptiſm.* So that this is alſo your own error and overſight.

VIII. You charge him with a notorious untruth, *p.* 185. for affirming from the *Magd. That* Gulielmus *added the* Virgin Mary *to the form of Baptiſm.* VVe have examined the *Magd. Cen.* 13. *p.* 419 *Cap.* 4.

Edit.

Edit. Basil Anno 1574. and find the words, *Male* Gulielmus *ad formam Baptismi addidit* Mariam *Baptizo te in nomine patris omnipotentis, & filii & spiritus sancti, & Beate Virginis*, as Cited by *Mr. Danvers*; and therefore for you to affirm the contrary is a gross mistake.

And thus, Sir, we have given a true and impartial representation of the Particulars as we find them, being, as we conceive, the principal matters under our *Cognizance*, omitting the less material, & do recommend them to your *Christian consideration*, hoping that your serious review of them, will discover them to be your *errors*. And as *Mr. Danvers* has publickly owned what of mistake he is convinced of in his *Answer* to your *Appeal*: So it is justly *expected*, you will also, *according to your promise*

miſe in the Preface to your Appeal, do the ſame in theſe Particulars.

And ſince your Charges do not appear to be true to the ſatisfaction of all impartial perſons; but on the contrary great miſtakes on your ſide, you will not, we hope, *think it unjuſt if we acquit him, & reflect the blame of the Charge upon your ſelf, as you deſire, in caſe you be found in the error.*

The Particulars Mr. *Danvers* owns in his ſaid *Anſwer* to your *Appeal*, we bring not under our diſcuſſion or cenſure, concluding it to be enough that he acknowledges them.

And ſuch petty Charges as he *ſufficiently anſwers*, and are indeed of little weight, ſave to *inhaunce* the number of your Particulars, as alſo things controverted, and only *collateral* to the grand Propoſition in diſpute, (as are *thoſe things you call*

ſtrange

ſtrange Doctrins, &c.) we think do not ſo properly offer themſelves to our Conſiderations. And therefore we conclude we may be excuſed if we wave them.

And laſtly, we propoſe, That if the Return we give to your *Appeal* ſhould be deemed *inſufficient* by you, or *ſhort in* any thing, (which we are not conſcious of) and that thereupon you take your ſelf concerned to appear any further in *this Controverſie*, you would be perſwaded, that things may be tranſacted in an *amicable* and *friendly* way; which we hope may tend to our *mutual ſatisfaction* in the clearing up of Truth, and to Cheriſh that love, that all that fear the Lord ſhould bear each other, though differing in ſome things, which is our very earneſt deſire; and to promote which, we ſhall endeavour to contribute the utmoſt we can.

London the 13*th*. of the 5*th*. Month 1675.

Hanſ. Knollys.
Will. Kyffen.
Dan. Dyke.
Jo. Goſnold.
Hen. Forty.
Tho. De Laune.

A POSTSCRIPT by *H. D.*

FOR the Readers better and more full satisfaction (after the great cry against me for Forgery *and* Prevarication *by my* Antagonists *) I have here given you together, this brief account of all the mistakes of moment that I have met with from any hand. And which the Reader is desired to correct in the* Treatise *as he meets with them; which are as followeth, viz.*

1. *Of my own or Friends discovery*, p. 55. 56. for Easter r. Western, p. 139. for *Erasmus* r. *Beza*, p. 124. dele what is produced from *Lanafrank* about *Beringarius*, and p. 68. and 115. and Index, dele the Canon of the Council of *Constant*, as spurious.
2. Of Mr. *Baxters* finding out, p. 223. for 3 & 4 book against the *Donatists*, r. 4 book, p. 286. 294. for *Cochleus* r. *Walden*.
3. Of Mr. *Wills*, p. 75. for *Aquinas*, r. *Albertus*, p. 116. dele *Deodans*, and for *Hincmarus* r. *Sericius*, p. 117. r. *Magdeburgs* for *Zonaras*, p. 155. for *work no such cause*, r. *be no such cause*, p. 287. dele *Pelagius* and *Vincentius Victor*.

These being all the errors of any weight I have yet met with from any: The judicious Reader will be more able to discern;

1. *Whe-*

1. *Whether here be any* Forgery *or* Prevarication, *or any wilful* abuse, *or* misleading *the Reader,* (*as with so much virulence suggested*) *or any other over-sight or mistakes, then such as usually attend other writings; and therefore whether all the clamour and out-cry of my Antagonists, discovers not more of* malice *then* matter, *and is the result rather of* prejudice *and* passion, *then a* zeal *for the candid investigation of truth.* *

2. *Whether since the Exceptions appear to be so* insignificant *and* immaterial *to the great point contended about, and no weightyer objections made good after so severe a scrutiny, and troubling the World with the dust and pudder made about them, the Question in debate be not fully given up, viz.* That it is now clearly manifest, that there is no Primitive Antiquity for Infants Baptism, nor no Record to make it appear that it was practiced as Christs Ordinance for the first 300 years; *The truth whereof having not only been evinced by unanswered Arguments and Demonstration; but from their own Pens, being constrained at last to acknowledge,* That except in case of danger of Death, there is no Record in the History of the Church for the necessity thereof in those first times.

Therefore the Reader is desired to take notice what ground *we get herein, and how far this* consideration *tends to justifie our practice,* viz.

1. *That the Baptizing of Believers, after profession of Faith, is not only evidenced by express precept and example from the Scripture; (the true and only way whereby Christs Ordinances are established to Protestants) but by the universal consent of all Ages; our very* Enemies *being* Judges.

2. *The*

* *To lead from the main question to things not to the purpose, and make a heavy stir about them, is the right Method of Cavillers, and which my Opposites take with me in this controversie.*

2. *That the Baptizing of Infants is neither to be made good by any* expres's precept *or* practice *from Scripture; nor as an* Apostolical Tradition *for these first and purest times; as our Adversaries also acknowledge; though they would insinuate as if they could consequentially deduce it; whereas no natural nor unforc'd consequence can be inferr'd in its favour from Scripture or primitive Antiquity, but absurd and illogical* non-sequiturs, *proving nothing so much as the weakness of the cause they endeavour to support.*

So that it necessarily and undeniably follows, That though Papists *and some* Protestants *may plead* Antiquity *since the* 5th. Century, *and no higher (the* Milevitan *Synod that first imposed it, being in the year* 416.*) for the necessity of Baptizing of Children to* take away Original sin, regenerate *and* save their Souls, *with the Concomitants of* Chrysm, Exorcism, Gossips, *&c. Yet the* Protestants *with whom we have to do* (owning this to be a poysonous Antichristian Doctrine) *cannot pretend higher for their Christning Children upon the account of* fœderal * *right then the* 15*th. or* 16*th. Century. And that therefore (they rejecting the grounds of the Ancients) their Infants Baptism upon this new* Medium *is a very* novelty. *So that I hope we shall hear no more of Antiquity for Infants Baptism of any sort.*

* *which novel argument of fœderal right is excellently refuted by Mr.* Ep. Hutchinson.

And 3*ly, that it yet undeniably appears, that a famous Witness has been born for* Believers *and against* Infants Baptism *in the successive Ages since Christ.*

And as a further ratification of the truth of these things pleaded for betwixt us in this contest, it may not be unnecessary to mind the Reader the sense that

that some standers *have given by their* suffrages, *both as to the* manner *and* matter *pleaded for, which you have exemplified in the learned and judicious disquisitions of* Mr. Hutchinson *in his late* Reflections *and* Animadversions *upon* Mr. Baxter, Mr. Wills, *and* Whiston's *Writings. The Letter of* Mr. T. B. *to* Mr. Wills, *the Epistle of* Mr. Tho. DeLaune *before* Mr. Hutchinson's; *all of them so great strangers to me, that I neither ever saw any of their* Faces, *or so much as heard of their* names *that I know of, before their said* works.

And to which I may presume to add a Letter sent to me upon this occasion, by a person of Quality, *a searcher into this Controversie, and one of known* worth, ability, *and* moderation; *which you may take as followeth.*

SIR,

As to Mr. *Baxters* Piece (which so soon as I heard of, I forthwith sent for) I have cursorily run over, especially that part thereof, which more immediately concerns your self, and am sorry to see so much *Rancor* and *Malice* in the Writings of one who hath had so great a Name for *Religion* and *Piety*: But whither will not *Pride, Passion*, and an *Over-weaning Opinion* of a mans self carry those who are overcome by them?

When I first read your *Treatise of Baptism*, I hoped it would have occasioned a *serious* and *full disquisition* of that point; but whether through the *unhappy* temper of your *Opponents*, or what else I know not. I have been hitherto disappointed in my expectation, meeting in their writings

with

with more of *heat, passion*, and *personal reflections*, then of *Reason* or a *sober Inquisition* after Truth.

I am not so well vers'd in *Antiquity*, as to say when *Infant Baptism* first came in use amongst *Christians*; but admire a matter of *fact* onely, as that is, should be so difficult to be determined: But if it were not in all, or at least the first and *purest* Ages of *Christianity*, (as some learned *Pædobaptists* seem to grant it was not) it cannot be said to be of *Apostolical Tradition*; the best plea, if true, I have yet heard for it; and therefore I could wish that point had been *soberly* and *calmly* debated. I must confess, I know not of any *difference* amongst *Professors*, of more *unhappy* and *pernicious* consequence then this of *Baptism*, in regard of that *separation* and *division* it causes amongst learned, sincere, and truly pious Christians; for such I no ways doubt but there are of both perswasions. But 'tis matter of greatest trouble and sorrow to me, to see with what *uncharitable* and *unchristian Spirits* some men manage this controversie, even to the reproach and scandal of Religion, and this too in a day, when our common sufferings ought in prudence, if not for Piety-sake to unite us, at least in *Brotherly* love, and a Christian walking together so far as we have *attained*, and in other things to a patient waiting for the *Revelation* of the mind of God, to them that differ; who in his good time will, I doubt not, *Unite* our *Affections*, *Heal* our *Breaches*, and make us all but *one Sheep-fold*, under the great Shepherd of the Sheep *Christ Jesus*, to whose guidance and protection I most heartily recommend you, and for the present remain, *&c.*

And

A Postscript by H. D.

And lastly, I hope the Baptists *answer to Mr.* Wills *his* Appeal *against me, will have no small tendency to issue this Controversie, whose diligent search (by those learned Men they appointed thereto) into the Authors quoted by me, and excepted against by him, will be a sufficient vindication (I doubt not) of my* integrity *in my* Quotations, *as well as the truth asserted thereby; and a due Reproof to Mr.* Wills *for his great* Temerity, *being himself so eminently found guilty by them in so many things he so injuriously charges upon me, insomuch that they (as he desires,* in case my innocency appears to them*) as you see, have thought just to acquit me, and reflect the blame of the Charge upon himself: All which is again submitted to his Conscience, the Impartial Readers, and the blessing of the Almighty. By*

H. D.